



भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं० 19]

नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, मई 10, 1980/वैशाख 20, 1902

No. 19]

NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, MAY 10, 1980/VAISAKHA 20, 1902

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके
Separate paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii) PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

(रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़ कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों और (संघ राज्यक्षेत्र प्रशासनों को छोड़ कर)
केन्द्रीय प्राधिकारियों द्वारा जारी किए गए सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं
Statutory Orders and Notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India
(other than the Ministry of Defence) by Central Authorities (other than the
Administrations of Union Territories)

भारत निर्वाचन आयोग

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 26 अप्रैल, 1980

का० अ० 1264.—उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के जून, 1977 में हुए साधारण निर्वाचन में 367 सादाबाद निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से निर्वाचन लड़ने वाले एक अभ्यर्थी श्री हरी ओम, ग्राम व पो० महारा, जिला मथुरा (उत्तर प्रदेश) को निर्वाचन आयोग द्वारा लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 की धारा 10 क के अधीन उक्त अधिनियम और तदधीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा यथा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहने के कारण इसके तारीख 14 फरवरी, 1980 के आदेश सं० उ० प्र० वि० सं०/367/77(77) के द्वारा निरहता किया गया था,

और, उक्त श्री हरी ओम ने उनके ऊपर अधिरोपित निरहता को हटाने के लिए भारत निर्वाचन आयोग के समक्ष एक अपील दाखिल की है जिसमें उन्होंने विधि द्वारा यथा अपेक्षित लेखा दाखिल करने में अपनी असफलता के कारण बताया है;

और, निर्वाचन आयोग ने उक्त अभ्यावेदन पर विचार किया है तथा प्रतीति श्री हरी ओम की गुनवाई भी की है,

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 11 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए निर्वाचन आयोग ने अपने तारीख 26 अप्रैल, 1980 के आदेश द्वारा उन पर अधिरोपित निरहता की कालावधि घटाकर उतनी कर दी है जितनी कि वे पहले ही भोग चुके हैं और अनवसित कालावधि के लिए उनकी निरहता तारीख 26 अप्रैल, 1980 से हटा दी है।

[सं० उ० प्र० वि० सं०/367/77]

आदेश से,
के० गणेशन, सचिव,
भारत निर्वाचन आयोग

ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA ORDER

New Delhi, the 26th April, 1980

S.O. 1264.—Whereas, Shri Hari Om, Village and P.O. Mehrara, District Mathura (U.P.), a contesting candidate for general election to the Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly from 367-Sadabad constituency held in June, 1977 was disqualified by the Election Commission vide its Order No. UP-LA/367/77(77), dated the 14th February, 1980, under section 10A of the Representation of the People Act, 1951, for the failure to lodge the account of his election expenses as required by the said Act and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said Shri Hari Om has submitted a petition before the Election Commission of India for the removal of the disqualification imposed on him, giving reasons for his failure to lodge the account as required by law;

And Whereas, the Election Commission has taken into account the said representation and also heard the petitioner, Shri Hari Om;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 11 of the said Act, the Election Commission has by

an order dated the 26th April, 1980, reduced the period of disqualification imposed on him to the period of disqualification already suffered by him and removed the disqualification for the unexpired period with effect from 26th April, 1980.

[No. UP-LA/367/77]

By Order,

K. GANESAN, Secy.

to the Election Commission of India.

विधि, न्याय और कम्पनी कार्य मंत्रालय

(विधि कार्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 11 फरवरी, 1980

का० आ० 1265.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, नोटरी अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 53) की धारा 6 के उपबन्धों के अनुसरण में, वर्ष 1980 के प्रारम्भ में नियुक्त किये गए और कार्य कर रहे नोटरियो की सूची प्रकाशित करती है :—

क्र० सं०	नोटरी का नाम	निवास स्थान तथा वृत्तिक पता	अहंताएं	क्षेत्र जिसमें विधि व्यवसाय करने के लिए प्राधिकृत है	टिप्पणी
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	श्री चक्रवर्ती डोराम्बामो	मैसर्स किश और पेटरिज, कौचलिक सेंटर (बूसरी मंजिल) 6, ग्रामोनियन स्ट्रीट, मद्रास-1	एडवोकेट, मद्रास उच्च न्यायालय	सम्पूर्ण भारत	
2.	श्री बाटा कृष्ण बनर्जी	कुंज निवास, 23-ए, सरदार शंकर, रोड, थाना टाप्पीगंज, कलकत्ता।	एडवोकेट, कलकत्ता उच्च न्यायालय	सम्पूर्ण भारत	
3.	श्री भगवती प्रसाद खेतान	1-बी०, ओल्ड पोस्ट आफिस स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता-1	अटर्नी एट ला कलकत्ता उच्च न्यायालय।	सम्पूर्ण भारत	
4.	श्री रवीन्द्र कृष्ण देव	टैम्पल चौमर्म्, 6, ओल्ड पोस्ट आफिस स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता।	अटर्नी एट ला कलकत्ता उच्च न्यायालय।	सम्पूर्ण भारत	
5.	श्री हिमांशु प्रकाश गायुली	4, इस्सुर दत्त मेन, हावड़ा, (प० बंगाल)	एडवोकेट कलकत्ता उच्च न्यायालय	भारत	
6.	श्री सुधीर कुमार डे मालिक	द्वारा मार्टिन बर्न लि० 12, मिशन रो एक्सटेंशन, कलकत्ता।	अटर्नी एट ला कलकत्ता	भारत	
7.	श्री राध मोहन चटर्जी	द्वारा मैसर्स और, विगतम एण्ड को०, सालिमिटर्स, 29, नेताजी सुभाष रोड, कलकत्ता।	सालिमिटर्स, कलकत्ता उच्च न्यायालय।	पश्चिम बंगाल, अरुण, बिहार, उत्तर प्रदेश और पंजाब	
8.	श्री प्रभुदयाल हिमतीसिंगा	6, ओल्ड पोस्ट आफिस स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता।	अटर्नी एट ला कलकत्ता उच्च न्यायालय।	भारत	
9.	श्री पुण्यव्रत बोस	10, किरण शंकर राय रोड, कलकत्ता।	अटर्नी एट ला कलकत्ता उच्च न्यायालय।	भारत	
10.	श्री विकटर इलियास मोसेज	6, ओल्ड पोस्ट आफिस स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता-1	अटर्नी एट ला कलकत्ता उच्च न्यायालय।	भारत	
11.	श्री मूलकराज बाधवान्	एडवोकेट, जलधर मिठी, पंजाब।	एडवोकेट पंजाब उच्च न्यायालय	पंजाब तथा उत्तर प्रदेश	
12.	श्री मनोहर लाल कपूर	319, पटेल नगर, (पूर्वी) नई दिल्ली।	एडवोकेट	दिल्ली मध शामिल क्षेत्र।	
13.	श्री हर प्रसाद मेहरा	न० 3066, चर्खवाला, दिल्ली।	एडवोकेट पंजाब उच्च न्यायालय	दिल्ली संघ शामिल क्षेत्र।	
14.	श्रीराम विष्णु मल	7/13, पटेल नगर, (पूर्वी) नई दिल्ली।	एडवोकेट उच्चतम न्यायालय	दिल्ली, मध शामिल क्षेत्र, राजस्थान, पंजाब और उत्तर प्रदेश।	

1	2	3	4	5	6
15.	श्री अन्न बहादुर प्रसिद्धी	सीतापुर, उत्तर प्रदेश।	वकील	जिला सीतापुर (उत्तर प्रदेश)	
16.	श्री जमन लाल शरीरा	10, न्यू कोर्ट रोड, भूमनगर पंजाब।	एडवोकेट	जिला भूमनगर (पंजाब)	
17.	श्री रामोदर देवजी रामोदर	द्वारा मैसर्स कांगा एण्ड कों मालिमिटर्स रेडी मनोमैत गन्म 43, बीर नरिसन रोड, मुम्बई।	मालिसीटर	महाराष्ट्र	
18.	श्री देव प्रसाद घोष	12, गवर्नमेंट प्लेग (पूर्वी) कलकत्ता-1	घटनी	सम्पूर्ण भारत	
19.	श्री नाथमल हिमतासिंग का	6, मोल्ड पोस्ट आफिस स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता।	घटनी	सम्पूर्ण भारत	
20.	श्री नवल एम० फातरफेकर	द्वारा मैसर्स काफोर्ड बेनी एण्ड कों, स्टेट बैंक बिल्डिंग, बैंक स्ट्रीट, मुम्बई-1	एडवोकेट	सम्पूर्ण भारत	
21.	श्री सी० एच० पार्दीबाला	मालिसीटर द्वारा मैसर्स काफोर्ड बेनी एण्ड को० स्टेट बैंक बिल्डिंग, बैंक स्ट्रीट, मुम्बई-1	मालिसीटर	सम्पूर्ण भारत	
22.	श्री शशीन्द्र सी० सेन	न्यायवादी, टेम्पल चैम्बर्स, पहली मंजिल, 6, मोल्ड पोस्ट आफिस स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता।	घटनी	कलकत्ता	
23.	श्री डी०ए० मेहता	एडवोकेट, 34-बी०, हनुमान रोड, नई दिल्ली।	बार-एट-ला	दिल्ली संघ शासित क्षेत्र	
24.	श्री बुर्गा प्रसाद तुलस्यान	एडवोकेट, भुंभुनू, (राजस्थान)।	एडवोकेट	जिला भुंभुनू (राजस्थान)	
25.	श्री नूर मोहम्मद	एडवोकेट, उदयपुर (राजस्थान)	एडवोकेट	जिला उदयपुर	
26.	श्री सुधीर कुमार जील	द्वारा मैसर्स सेंडरसन्स एण्ड मोरगन्स, मालिसीटर रायल इंशोरेंस भवन, 5 व 7 नेताजी मुभाय रोड, कलकत्ता-1	मालिसीटर	सम्पूर्ण भारत	
27.	श्री जितेन्द्र नाथ सान्याल	द्वारा मैसर्स सेंडरसन्स एण्ड मोरगन्स, मालिसीटर रायल इंशोरेंस भवन, 5 व 7 नेताजी मुभाय रोड, कलकत्ता-1	मालिसीटर	सम्पूर्ण भारत	
28.	श्री इन्द्र सेन इसरानी	एडवोकेट, जे-54, कृष्ण मार्ग, जयपुर (राजस्थान)।	एडवोकेट	जयपुर शहर और जिला	
29.	श्री पी० सी० कुरियान	14 कोनडी चेद्वी स्ट्रीट, मद्रास-1	एडवोकेट	मद्रास और केरल	
30.	श्री गुरदयाल सिंह निधू	नं० 1, डेकोहा, जलंधर (पंजाब)	एडवोकेट	जिला जलंधर	
31.	श्री सी० एम० बेंकटमुक्कमणियन	140, कासकट रोड, कोयम्ब- टूर-12	एडवोकेट	जिला कोयम्बटूर	
32.	श्री पुष्कर लाल जुनेजा	एफ-2, भगतसिंह मार्केट, लेडी हार्डिंग रोड, नई दिल्ली तथा एफ-1, शंकर मार्केट कनाट सर्कस, नई दिल्ली।	एडवोकेट	सम्पूर्ण भारत	
33.	श्री चुनी लाल भाटिया	सी 4-ए/68 गी, जनकपुरी, नई दिल्ली।	एडवोकेट	दिल्ली संघ शासित क्षेत्र	

1	2	3	4	5	6
34.	श्री जगन्नाथ	मोगा, जिला फिरोजपुर, (पंजाब)	एडवोकेट	मोगा स्थित मुख्यालय के साथ फिरोजपुर जिला मोगा स्थित मुख्यालय के साथ पूरे फरीदकोट जिले में काम करने के लिए भी प्राधिकृत है	
35.	श्री रामजी दाम मिथल	गुरद्वारा स्ट्रीट भटिंडा (पंजाब)।	एडवोकेट	जिला भटिंडा	
36.	श्री जी० वी० भट्ट	मैमर्स भट्ट एण्ड सन्धाना मेकर भवन तथा न० 1, सर विठलदास श्रैफरसी मार्ग, मुम्बई।	अटर्नी तथा एडवोकेट	सम्पूर्ण भारत	
37.	श्री वैबरज सिंह त्यागी	एडवोकेट, कलवटोरेट कोर्ट, कुलन्द शहर, उ० प्र०।	एडवोकेट	जिला बुलन्दशहर उ० प्र०	
38.	श्री बालकृष्ण	एडवोकेट, हनुमान गढ़ टाउन, जिला गंगा नगर (राजस्थान)	एडवोकेट	जिला गंगा नगर मुख्य कार्यालय हनुमान गढ़ (राज०)	
39.	श्री एस० आर० मेहता	एडवोकेट बलौला (राजस्थान)	एडवोकेट	जिला बाड़मेर और जायसमेर, मुख्य कार्यालय बलौला (राजस्थान)	
40.	श्री डी० डी० कपकड़	एडवोकेट, 3619, पूर्वी पटेल, नगर, नई दिल्ली।	एडवोकेट	दिल्ली संघ शासित क्षेत्र	
41.	श्री पी० एल० राधी	एडवोकेट, गांधी बाग के सामने सूरत।	एडवोकेट	जिला सूरत	
42.	श्री एम० आर० मल्कानी	एडवोकेट, बी० बी० जेड-०एन०-6 गांधीधाम (कच्छ)।	एडवोकेट	जिला कच्छ का अंजार नालुका	
43.	श्री एन० सी० शाह	द्वारा खेतान एण्ड को० सालि-सीटर्स 1-बी०, प्रोल्ड पोस्ट आफिस स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता-1	एडवोकेट कलकत्ता	कलकत्ता और नई दिल्ली	
44.	श्री टी० दलीप सिंह	द्वारा मैमर्स किंग एण्ड पारटिज दूसरी मंजिल कैथोलिक सेंटर, आरमेनियन स्ट्रीट, पो० बाक्स न० 121 मद्रास-1	एडवोकेट मद्रास	सम्पूर्ण भारत	
45.	श्री जे० आर० गगरात	द्वारा मैमर्स गगरात एण्ड को० अल्ली चैम्बर्स, नगीन वाग मास्टर रोड, फोर्ट, मुम्बई-1	एडवोकेट मुम्बई	सम्पूर्ण भारत	
46.	श्री आर० सैतसूर	द्वारा क्राफार्ड शैल एण्ड को० स्टेट बैंक बिल्डिंग, बैंक स्ट्रीट, मुम्बई-1।	अटर्नी तथा एडवोकेट, मुम्बई-1	सम्पूर्ण भारत	
47.	श्री वृजमोहन मेहता	13-ए/12, राजेन्द्र नगर, नई दिल्ली-7,	एडवोकेट, नई दिल्ली	दिल्ली संघ शासित क्षेत्र	
48.	श्री नैनी गोपाल दत्त	56/1, एम० एन० सेन सेन, टालीगंज, जिला 24 परगना, प० बंगाल।	एडवोकेट कलकत्ता	जिला 24 परगना, अलीपुर, कलकत्ता	
49.	श्री सुरजीत सिंह मूद	23, नेताजी पार्क, जलंधर शहर (पंजाब)।	एडवोकेट, जलंधर	जलंधर	
50.	श्री जगजीत सिंह बैम्स	376-के०, माइल टाउन, जलंधर शहर (पंजाब)	एडवोकेट, जलंधर	जलंधर	
51.	श्री के० जे० खन्नाता	राजब महल, 144 क्वीन्स रोड, मुम्बई-20	एडवोकेट, मुम्बई	सम्पूर्ण भारत	

1	2	3	4	5	6
52.	श्री प्रमोदलाल भावा भाई पटेल	वैद्य स्ट्रीट, डाक खाना तबसारी, जिला बुलसर (गुजरात)	एडवोकेट		जिला बुलसर (गुजरात)
53	श्री पूम चन्दा रामचन्द्र झा।	द्वारा मैसर्स पूर्णचन्द्र एण्ड कां०, गुजरात सरकार, के सालि- सीटमें अद्वैत हरिदास कालांजी, नवजीवन प्रेम रोड, अहमदाबाद-14	एडवोकेट		गुजरात
54.	श्री बी० टी० मर्चेंट	मैसर्स टाकुर दास एण्ड सहकायकर फोर्ट चैम्बर, डीन लेन फोर्ट, मुम्बई-400001	अद्वैत तथा एडवोकेट		संपूर्ण भारत
55	श्री कन्नाम, धार० दादाबन्नी	धुम बिल्डिंग, प्रथम मंजिल, 23/25, घोंगा स्ट्रीट, फोर्ट, मुम्बई-1	एडवोकेट		श्रेटर मुम्बई-1
56	श्री एच० एम० भगत	द्वारा अम्बूभाई व दीवाजी, लैटिन चैम्बर, वलाल स्ट्रीट फोर्ट, मुम्बई तथा द्वारा अम्बूभाई व दीवानजी साली- सीटमें बैंक आफ इंडिया बिल्डिंग, अहमदाबाद-380001	एडवोकेट तथा सालिसीटर		गुजरात
57.	श्री एच० बी० छत्रपति	द्वारा मैसर्स भाई शंकर कांसा एण्ड गिरधारी लाल, मानक- जी बाधिया बिल्डिंग बेय लेन, फोर्ट, मुम्बई-400001, तथा द्वारा मैसर्स भाई शंकर कांसा एण्ड गिरधारी लाल, गुजरात समाचार भवन खानपुर, अहमदाबाद	एडवोकेट तथा सालिसीटर		गुजरात
58.	श्री जी० एम० व्यास	35, लाक्ष्म्य नगर, जीधराज पार्क रोड, एल्लिस ब्रिज, अहमदा- बाद-7	एडवोकेट		अहमदाबाद
59.	श्री अमर सिंह	जमिंदार सिंह रोड भोगा, जिला फरीदकोट (पंजाब)	एडवोकेट		भोगा, जिला फरीदकोट (पंजाब)
60.	श्री बी० एच० अतिया	द्वारा मैसर्स मुल्ला, मुल्ला एण्ड कैरी, स्लैट एण्ड कैरी, सालिसीटमें एण्ड मोटरीज जहांगीर बाधिया बिल्डिंग, 51, महात्मा गांधी रोड, मुम्बई-400001	अद्वैत तथा एडवोकेट		संपूर्ण भारत
61.	श्री बी०पी० शुक्ल	रघुनाथ बिल्डिंग, टाउन हॉल के मामने, राजकोट (गुजरात)	एडवोकेट		जिला राजकोट तथा जूनागढ़
62.	श्री बी० के० शाह	मनमुख निवास, मैनी छिपनाड, एडवोकेट	एडवोकेट		बडोदा
63.	श्री रमेश जे० मेहता	एडवोकेट तड़ियाद जिला कैरा, गुजरात राज्य	एडवोकेट		जिला कैरा तथा पांचमहल
64.	श्री वसन्त लाल डी० मेहता	द्वारा मास्वी स्टैंडेंस एण्ड को०, सालिसीटमें एण्ड एडवोकेट्स, यूसफ बिल्डिंग, महात्मा गांधी रोड, फोर्ट, मुम्बई-400001	सालिसीटर		महाराष्ट्र

1	2	3	4	5	6
65.	श्री प्रकाश चन्द्र जैन	82, खुरबाग, देहवगाहन	एडवोकेट	पश्चिम उत्तराखण्ड (यू० पी० की जजश्रीप, कार्बानिय देहवगाहन	
66.	श्री मोहन एफ० करमाणावा	जब, गेट, नैम्बर्स 5, नई मेरीन लाईन, कमरा नं० 611, 6वां, फ्लोर, मुम्बई-400001	सालिसीटर	संपूर्ण महाराष्ट्र राज्य मुख्य कार्यालय, मुम्बई।	
67.	श्री दर्शन सिंह	ए-321, डिफेंस बालोनी, नई दिल्ली।	एडवोकेट	दिल्ली संघ शासित क्षेत्र।	
68.	श्रीमती के० बी० देसाई	5, भरत कोलांनी सरदार पटेल कार्यालय के तबदीक, अहमदाबाद-14	एडवोकेट	अहमदाबाद	
69.	श्री राजेन्द्र कुमार भट्ट	एम०-401, ग्रेटर कैलाश, नई दिल्ली-48	एडवोकेट	दिल्ली संघ शासित क्षेत्र, उत्तर प्रदेश और हरियाणा।	
70.	श्री नारायण प्रसाद गोयल	ई-165, नारायण बिहार, नई दिल्ली-28	एडवोकेट	दिल्ली संघ शासित क्षेत्र।	
71.	श्री के० बी० धोमस	विराजगोट, जिला कुर्ग, कर्नाटक।	एडवोकेट	जिला कुर्ग	
72.	श्री बी० हसन कोया	चालपुरम, कार्यालय केरल मैमर्स एम० के० गंगुली एण्ड को० सालिसीटरम।	एडवोकेट	जिला कार्यालय तथा मालपुरम	
73.	श्री सचिन कुमार गंगुली	50, रामननु थोम लेन कलकत्ता।	अटर्नी एट ला तथा एडवोकेट	कलकत्ता।	
74.	श्री पल्लव कुमार बैनर्जी	मैमर्स टी० बैनर्जी एण्ड को०, सालिसीटर तथा एडवोकेट्स "टैम्पुल नैम्बर्स", नं० 6, ग्रील्ड पोस्ट आफिस स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता।	सालिसीटर तथा एडवोकेट	कलकत्ता	
75.	श्री एम०वाई०एम० सैन	मैमर्स मजूमदार एण्ड को०, इसमाइल बिल्डिंग, 381, डा० डी०एम० रोड, (प्लीया फाउन्टेन्स) मुम्बई।	सालिसीटर तथा वोकैट	ग्रेटर मुम्बई।	
76.	श्री ब० भूषण गुप्त	कलाल माजरी, अम्बाला जहर।	एडवोकेट	अम्बाला जहर	
77.	श्री रघुबीर सिंह कुल्लर	बैशा तहसील, राजस्थान	एडवोकेट	बैशा तहसील	
78.	श्री सलामत राय झा० रबीनी	202, कंवर नगर, राजमहल का तालाब, जयपुर।	एडवोकेट	जयपुर।	
79.	श्री नन्द किशोर पारिख	321, नहरगढ़ रोड, गोपाल हलवाई की गली, जयपुर।	एडवोकेट	जयपुर।	
80.	श्री अश्विनेश्वर धाम धडगेल	ए-18, शान्तिपथ निलक नगर, जयपुर।	एडवोकेट	जयपुर	
81.	श्री डी०आर० जैवल्सा	मैमर्स डी०आर० जैवल्सा एण्ड को०, सालिसीटर्स "रेडिमता मेणन", 43 धीर तारिमन रोड, फोर्ट मुम्बई।	सालिसीटर एण्ड एडवोकेट	ग्रेटर मुम्बई।	
82.	श्री एम०जी० बोधित	मैमर्स एम०जी० बोधित, एण्ड को०, सालिसीटर्स, 35 एम्बेसी मार्केट अहमदाबाद	सालिसीटर	गुजरात और महाराष्ट्र	
83.	श्री एंथोनी डा० कोस्टा	मैमर्स डा० कोस्टा एण्ड डा० कोस्टा, एडवोकेट्स एण्ड टैक्स कन्सल्टेंट, 31/1, महान्ना गांधी रोड, मिजिल स्टेशन बंगलौर।	एडवोकेट	बंगलौर	

1	2	3	4	5	6
84.	श्रीमती सुमति अरविन्द पाटिल	236, जैन टैम्पल रोड, गोमिण नगर, इन्दवार्डी, बैलगांव।	एडवोकेट	जिला बैलगांव	
85.	श्री टी० एम० सैन	मैगर्स खेतान एण्ड को० सानि - मोटर्स एण्ड एडवोकेट्स, हिमालय हाऊस, 7वीं मंजिल 23, कम्प्लेक्स गोर्खा मार्ग, नई दिल्ली। बी०-88 नीली बाग, नई दिल्ली।	अटर्नी-एट ला	संपूर्ण भारत	
86.	श्रीमती न० अतुमुया बाई	4624/1, शिवाजी रोड, एन० आर० मोहल्ला, मैसूर-7	एडवोकेट	मैसूर शहर	
87.	श्री पद्मनाभ रांगाधर गोखले	ए-36, डिफेन्स कालोनी, नई दिल्ली।	एडवोकेट	संपूर्ण भारत	

[संख्या 5/6/80-न्याय]

के०सी०डी० रांगवाती,
अपर विधि सलाहकार।

MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS

(Department of Legal Affairs)

New Delhi, the 11th February, 1980

S.O. 1265.—In pursuance of the provisions of Section 6 of the Notaries Act, 1952 (53 of 1952), the Central Government hereby publishes a list of Notaries appointed by them and in practice at beginning of the year 1980.

Sl.	Name of Notary	Residential and Professional address	Qualifications	Area in which he is authorised to practise.	Remarks
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Shri Chakravarthi Doraswamy	M/s King and Pahtridge Catholic Centre, (2nd Floor), 6, Armenian Street, Madras-1.	Advocate Court.	Madras High Court. Whole of India	—
2.	Shri Bata Krishna Banarji	Koonja Nibas, 23-A, Sardar Shankar Road, P.S. Tollyganj, Calcutta.	Advocate Court.	Calcutta High Court. Whole of India	—
3.	Shri Bhagwati Prasad Khaitan.	1-B, Old P.O. Street, Calcutta.	Attorney-at Law, High Court.	Calcutta High Court. Whole of India	—
4.	Shri Rabindra Krishna Deb.	Temple Chambers, 6, Old Post Office Street, Calcutta.	Attorney-at Law, High Court.	Calcutta High Court. Whole of India	—
5.	Shri Himansu Prakash Ganguli.	4, Issur Dutt Lane, Howrah (West Bengal).	Advocate Court.	Calcutta High Court. Whole of India	—
6.	Shri Sudhir Kumar Dey Mullick.	C/o Martin Burn Ltd. 12, Mission Row Extension, Calcutta-1.	Attorney-at Law, High Court.	Calcutta High Court. Whole of India	—
7.	Sh. Rash Mohan Chatterjee.	C/o M/s Orr, Dignam and Co., Solicitors, 29, Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta.	Solicitor Court,	Calcutta High Court. West Bengal, Assam, Bihar, U.P. and Punjab.	—
8.	Sh. Prabhudayal Himsanka.	6, Old Post Office Street, Calcutta.	Attorney-at Law, High Court.	Calcutta High Court. Whole of India.	—
9.	Sh. Punyabarat Bose.	10, Kiran Shankar Roy Road, Calcutta.	Attorney-at Law, High Court.	Calcutta High Court. Whole of India.	—

1	2	3	4	5	6
10.	Sh. Victor Elias Moses.	6, Old Post Office, Street, Calcutta.	Attorney-at Law, High Court.	Calcutta	Whole of India.
11.	Sh. Mulkh Raj Wadhwani.	Advocate Jullundur City Punjab.	Advocate Punjab High Court.	Punjab	Punjab and U.P.
12.	Sh. Manhorlal Kapur.	3/9, Patel Nagar (East), Delhi.	Advocate.		Union Territory of Delhi.
13.	Sh. Harpershad Mehra.	No. 3060, Cherkhewalan Delhi.	Advocate Punjab High Court.	Punjab	Union Territory of Delhi.
14.	Shri Ram Ditta Mall.	7/13, Patel Nagar (East) New Delhi.	Advocate Supreme Court.		Union Territory of Delhi, Rajasthan, Punjab and U.P.
15.	Sh. Brij Bahadur Agnihotri.	Sitapur, U.P.	Vakil.		District Sitapur, U.P.
16.	Sh. Chaman Lal Arora.	10, New Court Road Amritsar, Punjab.	Advocate.		Amritsar District (Punjab)
17.	Sh. Demodar Devji Damodar.	C/o M/s. Kanga & Co. Solicitors Ready-money Mansions, 43, Veer Nariman Road, Bombay.	Solicitors		Maharashtra
18.	Sh. Duba Prasad Ghosh	12, Govt. Place East, Calcutta-1.	Attorney.		Whole of India.
19.	Sh. Nathmal Himatsingka	6, Old Post Office Street, Calcutta.	Attorney.		Whole of India.
20.	Sh. Nawal S. Phatarqphekar.	C/o M/s. Crewford Bayley & Co. State Bank Building, Bank Street, Bombay-1.	Advocate.		Whole of India.
21.	Sh. C.H. Paradiwala.	Solicitor, C/o M/s Crewford Bayley and Co., State Bank Bldgs., Bank St. Bombay.	Solicitor.		Whole of India.
22.	Sh. Sachindra C. Sen.	Attorney-at-law Temple Chambers, 1st Floor, 6 Old Post Office St., Calcutta.	Attorney.		Calcutta.
23.	Sh. D.A. Mehta.	Advocate, 43-B Hanuman Road, New Delhi.	Bar-at-law		Union Territory of Delhi.
24.	St. Durga Prasad Tulsyan.	Advocate, Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan.	Advocate.		Jhunjhunu District (Rajasthan).
25.	Sh. Noor Mohammed.	Advocate, Udaipur (Rajasthan).	Advocate.		Udaipur District.
26.	Sh. Sudhir Kumar Seal.	C/o M/s Sanersons & Morgans, Solicitors, Royal Insurance Bldgs. 5 & 7, Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta-1.	Solicitor.		Whole of India.
27.	Sh. Jitendra Nath Sanyal.	C/o M/s Sandarsons & Morgans, Solicitors, Royal Insurance Bldgs. 5 & 7, Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta-1.	Solicitor.		Whole of India.
28.	Shri Indersen Israni	Advocate, J-54 Krishna Marg, Jaipur (Raj.)	Advocate.		Jaipur City (and District).
29.	Shri P.C. Kurian.	14, Kondi Chatty Street, Madras-1.	Advocate.		Madras & Kerala.

1	2	3	4	5	6
30.	Shri Gurdyal Singh Sidhoo.	No. 1, Dakoha Jullundur (Punjab).	Advocate.	Jullundur District.	—
31.	Shri C.S. Venkata-Subramanian.	140, Cross Cut Road, Coimbatore-12	Advocate.	Coimbatore District.	—
32.	Shri Pushkar Lal Juneja.	F-2, Bhagat Singh Market, Lady Hardings Road, New Delhi and F-1, Shankar Market, Connaught Circus, New Delhi.	Advocate.	Whole of India.	—
33.	Shri Chuni Lal Bhatia.	C-4/A/68C, Janakpuri, New Delhi	Advocate.	Union Territory of Delhi.	—
34.	Shri Jagan Nath.	Moga, District Ferozepore (Punjab).	Advocate.	Ferozepur Distt. with Headquarters at Mong. Also authorised to practise in and throughout Feroz-Kot Distt. with Headquarters at Moga.	—
35.	Shri Ramji Das Singhal.	Gurdwara Street, Bhatinda (Punjab).	Advocate.	Bhatinda District.	—
36.	Shri G.V. Bhatt.	M/s Bhatt & Saldana Makar Bhavan No. 1, 1, Sir Vithaldas Thackersey Marg, Bombay.	Attorney & Advocate.	Whole of India.	—
37.	Shri Deoraj Singh Tyagi.	Advocate, Collectorate's Courts, Bhillandshahr U.P.	Advocate.	District Bhillandshahr U.P.	—
38.	Shri Bal Krishan.	Advocate Hanumangarh Town District Ganganagar (Rajasthan).	Advocate.	District Ganganagar with Headquarters at Hanumangarh (Rajasthan).	—
39.	Shri S.R. Mehta.	Advocate Balotra.	Advocate.	District of Barmer and Jalons with Headquarters at Balotra (Rajasthan).	—
40.	Shri D.D. Kakkar.	Advocate 36/9, East Patel Nagar, New Delhi-8.	Advocate.	Union Territory of Delhi.	—
41.	Shri P.L. Gandhi.	Advocate Opposite Gandhi, Baug, Surat.	Advocate.	Surat District.	—
42.	Shri A.R. Malkani.	Advocate BBZ-N6, Gandhidham (Kutch).	Advocate.	Anjar Taluka of Kutch District.	—
43.	Shri N.C. Shah.	C/o Khaitan & Co. Solicitors, 1-B, Old Post Office, Street, Calcutta-1.	Advocate Calcutta.	Calcutta and New Delhi.	—
44.	Shri T. Dilip Singh.	C/o Messrs King & Partridge, 2nd Floor, Catholic Centre, Armenian Street, East Box No. 121, Madras-1.	Advocate Madras.	Whole of India.	—
45.	Shri J.R. Gagrati.	C/o M/s Gagrati & Company, Alli Chambers, Neringdas Master Road, Fort-Bombay-1.	Advocate Bombay.	Whole of India.	—
46.	Shri R. Setlur.	C/o Crawford Baylay & Co. State Bank Bldgs. Bank Street, Bombay-1.	Attorney & Advocate.	Whole of India.	—
47.	Shri Brij Mohan Mehta.	13A/2, Rajinder Nagar, New Delhi.	Advocate, New Delhi.	Union Territory of Delhi.	—

1	2	3	4	5	6
48.	Shri Nani Gopal Datta.	56/1, M.N. Sen Lane, Tolly- gunge, Distt. 24, Parganas, West Bengal.	Advocate, Calcutta.	District 24, Parganas, Ali- pore, Calcutta.	—
49.	Shri Surjit Singh Sood.	23, Netaji Park Jullundur City (Punjab).	Advocate, Jullundur.	Jullundur.	—
50.	Shri Jagjit Singh Bains.	376. K. Model Town Jullun- dur City (Punjab).	Advocate, Jullundur.	Jullundur.	—
51.	Shri K.J. Khembata.	Rajab Mahal, 144, Queens Road.	Advocate, Bombay.	Whole of India.	—
52.	Shri Ambelal Bhavbhai Patel.	Vaidya Street, P.O. Nava- sari District Bulsar (Gujarat).	Advocate.	Bulsar District (Gujarat).	—
53.	Shri Punamchand Som- chand Shah.	C/o Messers Purana-Pand & Co. Solicitors to Govt. of Gujarat, 'Shradhe' Haridas Colony Navijiwan Press, Road, Ahmedabad-14.	Advocate.	Gujarat.	—
54.	Shri B.T. Merchand.	C/o Messrs Thakordas & Madavakar, Fort Cham- bers Dean Lane Fort, Bombay-400001.	Attorney & Advocate.	Whole of India.	—
55.	Shri Rustam R. Dada- chanji.	Dhun Building, 1st Floor, 23/25, Ghonga Street, Fort Bombay.	Advocate.	Greater Bombay.	—
56.	Shri H.M. Bhagat.	C/o Ambubhai & Diwaji, Lentin Chambers, Dalal Street, Fort, Bombay. and C/o Ambubhai and Diwan- ji, Solicitors and Advo- cates, Bank of India, Building, Ahmedabad- 380001.	Advocate & Solicitor.	Gujarat.	—
57.	Sh. H.V. Chatrapati.	C/o Messrs Bhai-Shankar Kanga & Girdhari Lal, Manakji Wadia Building Bell Lane, Fort Bombay- 400001. and C/o Messrs Bhaishankar Kanga and Girdhar Lal Gujarat Samachar Bha- van Khanpur, Ahmeda- bad-380001.	Advocate & Solicitor.	Gujarat.	—
58.	Shri G.S. Vyas.	35, Lavanunagar Jivaraj Park Road, Ellis Bridge, Ah- medabad-7.	Advocate.	Ahmedabad.	—
59.	Shri Amar Singh.	Jamiat Singh Road Moga, District Faridkot (Punjab).	Advocate.	Moga, District Faridkot, Punjab.	—
60.	Shri B.H. Antia.	C/o Messrs Mulla & Mulla & Craigle Blunt & Caroe, Solicitors and Notaries, Jehangir Wadia Building, 51 Mahatma Gandhi Road, Bombay-400001.	Advocate & Advocate.	Whole of India.	—
61.	Shri B.P. Shukal.	Rugnath Building Opp. Town Hall Rajkot (Gujarat).	Advocate.	Rajkot & Junagadh District.	—

1	2	3	4	5	6
62. Shri B.K. Shah.	Mansukh Niwas Maini Chhipwad.	Advocate.	Baroda.	—	
63. Shri Ram sh J. Mehta.	Advocate Nadiad District Kaira, Gujarat State.	Advocate.	Kaira & Panchamahals District.	—	
64. Shri Vasantlal D. Mehta.	C/o Malvi Ranchodas & Co. Solicitors and Advocates, Yusuf Building, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Fort, Bombay-400001.	Solicitor.	Maharashtra.	—	
65. Shri Praksh Chand Jain.	82, Khurbara Dehradun.	Advocate.	Judgship of West Uttarakhand (U.P.) with office at Dehradun.	—	
66. Shri Moiz F. Karamalawala.	Churchgate Chambers 5, New Marine Lines Room No. 611, 6th Floor, Bombay-400001.	Solicitors.	Whole of the State of Maharashtra with Headquarters at Bombay.	—	
67. Shri Darshan Singh	A-321, Defence Colony, New Delhi.	Advocate	Union Territory of Delhi.	—	
68. Mrs. K.V. Desai.	5, Bharat Colony Near Sardar Patel Colony, Ahmedabad-14.	Advocate.	Ahmedabad.	—	
69. Shri Rajendra Kumar Bhatt.	S-401, Greater Kailash New Delhi-48.	Advocate.	Union Territory of Delhi U.P. and Haryana.	—	
70. Shri Narayan Prasahad Goyal.	E-165, Narain Vihar New Delhi-28.	Advocate.	Union Territory of Delhi.	—	
71. Shri K.V. Thomas.	Virejpet Coorg Distt. Karanataka.	Advocate.	Coorg. Distt.	—	
72. Shri V. Hassan Koya.	Chelepuram, Calicut, Kerala. M/s S.K. Ganguli & Co., Solicitors.	Advocate.	Calicut & Malappuram District.	—	
73. Shri Salil Kumar Ganguli.	50, Ramtanu Bose Lane, Calcutta.	Attorney-at Law and Advocate.	Calcutta.	—	
74. Shri Palav Kumar Banerjee.	M/s T. Banerjee & Co. Solicitors and Advocates 'Tample Chambers' No. 6, Old Post Office Street, Calcutta.	Solicitor and Advocate.	Calcutta.	—	
75. Sh. M.Y.S. Menon.	M/s Majumdar & Co. Ismail Building 381, Dr. D.N. Road, (Flora Fountains), Bombay.	Solicitor & Advocate.	Greater Bombay.	—	
76. Sh. Brij Bhushan Gupta.	Kalal Majli, Ambala City.	Advocate.	Ambala City.	—	
77. Sh. Raghubir Singh Kulhar.	Chairwa Tehsil, Rajasthan.	Advocate.	Chirwa Tehsil.	—	
78. Sh. Salametrai Gurbeny.	0.202, Kanwar Nagar Rajamal-Ka-Talab, Jaipur.	Advocate.	Jaipur.	—	
79. Sh. Nand Kishore Pareek.	321, Mehargarh Road, Gopal Halwai Ki Gali, Jaipur.	Advocate.	Jaipur.	—	
80. Shri Akhileshwar Das Badgol.	A-18, Shanti Path Nagar, Jaipur.	Tilak Advocate.	Jaipur.	—	

1	2	3	4	5	6
81. Sh. D.R. Jaiwella.	M/s D.R. Zaiwalla & Co. Solicitors 'Readymoney' Mansion, 43, Veer Nariman Road, Fort, Bombay.	Solicitor & Advocate.		Greater Bombay.	—
82. Sh. M.S. Deshit	M/s M.G. Doshit & Co. Solicitors 35, Embassy Market Ahmedabad.	Solicitor.		Gujrat & Maharashtra.	—
83. Sh. Anthony da Costa.	M/s Da Costa and Da Costa, Advocates & Tax-Consultants, 31/1, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Civil Station, Bangalore.	Advocate.		Bangalore.	—
84. Mrs. Sumati Arvind Patil,	236, Jain Temple Road, Gomeshanagar Binswadi, Belgaum.	Advocate.		Belgaum District.	—
85. Sh. T.M. Sen.	M/s Khaitan & Co. Solicitors & Advocates Himayala House, 7th Floor, 23, Kasthurba Gandhi Marg, New Delhi. B-88, Neli Bagh, New Delhi.	Attorney-at Law.		Whole of India.	—
86. Smt. N. Anasooya Bai.	4624/1, Shivaji Road, N.R. Mohalla Mysore-7.	Advocate.		Mysore City.	—
87. Sh. Padmanabh Ganga-dhar Gokhale.	A-36, Defence Colony, New Delhi.	Advocate.		Whole of India.	—

[No. 5(6)/80-Judl]

K.C.D. GANGWANI

नई दिल्ली, 24 अप्रैल, 1980

सूचनाएं

क्र० आ० 1266 नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री कृष्ण सत्य मिश्रा एडवोकेट 103 केरानागुंज, जिला बहराईच, उ० प्र० ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे जिला बहराईच, उत्तर प्रदेश में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्त किया जाए।

उक्त व्यक्ति को नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप में मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं० 5(10)/80 न्या०]

New Delhi, the 24th April, 1980

NOTICES

S.O. 1266.—Notice is hereby given by the Government Authority in pursuance of rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956, that application has been made to the said Authority, under rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Krishna Chandra Misra, Advocate—103 Kerana Gunj, District-Bahraich of U.P. for appointment as a Notary to practise in District Bahraich of U.P.

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this Notice.

[No. F. 5(10)/80-Judl.]

क्र० आ० 1267 नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री नन्द लाल चौधरी, एडवोकेट, जे 4/15 राजोरी गार्डन, न्यू दिल्ली ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे दिल्ली में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्त किया जाए।

उक्त व्यक्ति की नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप में मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं० 5/13/79 न्या०]

S.O. 1267.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956, that application has been made to the said Authority, under rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Nand Lal Choudhury Advocate—J. 4/15 Rajouri Gardens, New Delhi, for appointment as a Notary to practise in Delhi.

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this Notice.

[No. F. 5/13/79-Judl]

नई दिल्ली, 26 अप्रैल, 1980

क्र० आ० 1268 नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री दिव्येश गुप्त, एडवोकेट 338 वेस्टर्न कचहरी रोड, मेरठ ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे उत्तर प्रदेश के मेरठ जिले में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्त किया जाए।

उक्त व्यक्ति की नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप में मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं० 5 (23)/80 न्या०]

क्र० सी० डी० गंगवानी, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

New Delhi, the 26th April, 1980

S.O. 1268.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956, that application has been made to the said Authority, under rule 4 of the said Rules, Shri Divyesh Gupta, Advocate, 338, W. K. Road, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh for appointment as a Notary to practise in Meerut District of Uttar Pradesh.

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this Notice.

[No. F.5(23)/80-Judl.]

K. C. D. GANGWANI, Competent Authority

नई दिल्ली 26 अप्रैल, 1980

(शास-प्राप्त लेखापाल)

क्र० आ० 1269 शासप्राप्त लेखापाल विनियम, 1964 के विनियम 181 के उप विनियम (2) के साथ पठित विनियम 2 के उप विनियम (2) के खण्ड (11) के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा भारत सरकार के श्रुतपूर्व विस्तृत मंत्रालय आर्थिक कार्य विभाग की अधिसूचना संख्या

62(43) आर्डर सी० एन० (क) दिनांक 4 अप्रैल, 1951 में निम्नलिखित और संशोधन करती है, अर्थात्:—

उक्त अधिसूचना में “अफगानिस्तान विश्वविद्यालय” शीर्ष के पञ्चात और उसके सम्बन्ध में निम्नलिखित शीर्ष और प्रविष्टियाँ समाविष्ट की जायेंगी, नामण: “न्यूज़ीलैण्ड में विश्वविद्यालय

विश्वविद्यालय, विभिन्नता।”

[फा० सं० 7/13/79 आर्डर सी०]
बी० बी० बारुरी, अधीक्षक सचिव

(Department of Company Affairs)

New Delhi, the 26th April, 1980

(CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS)

S.O. 1269.—In pursuance of clause (iii) of sub-regulation (1) of regulation 2, read with sub-regulation (2) of regulation 181 of the Chartered Accountants Regulations, 1964, the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Finance (Department of Economic Affairs) No. 62 (43)-ICF(A)/50, dated the 4th April, 1951, namely:—

In the said notification, after the heading “University in Afghanistan” and the entries relating thereto, the following heading and entries shall be inserted, namely:—

“University in New Zealand
Victoria University, Wellington.”

[F. No. 7/13/79-ICF]

B. B. BARURI, Under Secy.

रह संचालय

(कार्मिक और प्रशासनिक सुधार विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 24 अप्रैल, 1980

फा० आ० 1270.—राष्ट्रपति, मन्त्रिमण्डल के अन्तर्गत 309 के परन्तुक और अनुच्छेद 148 के खण्ड (5) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए तथा भारतीय लेखा परीक्षा और लेखा विभाग में सेवा कर रहे व्यक्तियों के संबंध में नियंत्रक और महालेखा परीक्षक से परामर्श करते के पश्चात् केन्द्रीय मिश्रित सेवा (आवरण) नियम, 1964 में और संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाए जाते हैं, अर्थात्:

1. (1) इन नियमों का नाम केन्द्रीय मिश्रित सेवा (आवरण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख को प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. (i) केन्द्रीय मिश्रित सेवा (आवरण) नियम, 1964 के नियम 13 के उपनियम (1) में विद्यमान परन्तुक के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित परन्तुक रखा जाएगा, अर्थात्:—

“परन्तु कोई सरकारी सेवक ऐसी मजूरी के बिना,

(i) सामाजिक अथवा पूर्ण शक्ति का अवैतनिक कार्य कर सकेगा, अथवा

(ii) सांख्यिक, कलात्मक या वैज्ञानिक स्वका का दस्तावेज कार्य कर सकेगा, अथवा

(iii) खेलकूद क्रियाकलापों में अव्यवस्थित रूप में भाग ले सकेगा, किन्तु शर्त यह है कि उसने उसके पदवी कर्तव्यों में बाधा न हो। वह ऐसा कार्य अथवा निष्ठावस्था उन दिनों में ही ले सकेगा जिन दिनों उसने उसी तारीख में सेवा, उपस्थिति, उसे ऐसा दिखाने दे।”

(ii) उपनियम (1) के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित उपनियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात्:—

“(4) तब तक कि सरकार के आदेश अथवा विशेष आदेशों द्वारा अन्यथा विहित नहीं किया जाता, कोई भी सरकारी सेवक किसी प्राईवेट अथवा लोक निकाय या प्राईवेट व्यक्ति से कोई भी भ्रष्टाचार, भ्रष्टाचार प्रवृत्ति की संकुरी के बिना, प्रति-प्रतीक नहीं कर सकेगा।

स्पष्टीकरण:—यहाँ प्रयोग किए गए शब्द “फोस” का यहाँ अर्थ है या मूल नियम 9 (6) में उसे दिया गया है।”

[सं० 11013/3/80-स्वायत्ता (क)]

बी० एम० निम, उप सचिव

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

(Department of Personnel & Administrative Reforms)

New Delhi, the 24th April, 1980

S.O. 1270.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to article 309 and clause (5) of article 148 of the Constitution, the President, after consultation with the Comptroller and Auditor General in relation to persons serv-

ing in the Indian Audit and Accounts Department, hereby makes the following rules, further to amend the Central Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964, namely:—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Central Civil Services (Conduct) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. (1) In the Central Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964, in rule 15, in sub-rule (1), for the existing proviso, the following proviso shall be substituted, namely:—

“Provided that a Government servant may, without such sanction—

(i) undertake honorary work of a social or charitable nature, or

(ii) undertake occasional work of a literary, artistic or scientific character, or

(iii) participate in sports activities as amateur; subject to the condition that in all the cases his official duties do not thereby suffer. He shall not undertake or shall discontinue, such work or activity, if so directed by the Government.”

(2) for sub-rule (4), the following sub-rule shall be substituted, namely:—

“(4) Unless otherwise provided by general or special orders of government, no Government servant may accept any fee for any work done by him for any private or public body or any private person without the sanction of the prescribed authority.

Explanation:—The term ‘fee’ used here shall have the meaning assigned to it in Fundamental Rule 9(6A).”

[No. 11013/3/80-Estt(A)]

B. S. NIM, Dy. Secy.

दित संशोधन

(राजस्व विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 22 दिसम्बर, 1979

फा० आ० 1271.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, आय-कर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (23-ग) के खण्ड (5) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, श्री पालीमार मुट्ट, उदुपी का निर्धारण वर्ष 1962-63 से निर्धारण वर्ष 1975-76 तक और निर्धारण वर्ष 1977-78 से निर्धारण वर्ष 1980-81 तक के लिए उक्त धारा के प्रयोजनार्थ अधिसूचित करती है।

[सं० 3107/फा० सं० 197/52/77-आ० क० (ए1)]

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Revenue)

New Delhi, the 22nd December, 1979

S.O. 1271.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (V) of sub-section (23c) of section 10 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby notifies ‘Sri Palimar Mutt, Udipi’ for the purpose of the said section for assessment years 1962-63 to assessment year 1975-76 and from assessment years 1977-78 to assessment year 1980-81.

[No. 3107/F. No. 197/52/77-IT(AI)]

नई दिल्ली, 29 जनवरी, 1980

(अध्यक्ष)

फा० आ० 1272.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, आय-कर अधिनियम 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (23-ग) के खण्ड (5) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, मालांकार मार्थोमा पारिशद और इसके अन्तर्गत पारिशदों और संस्थाओं का निर्धारण वर्ष 1978, 79-80 और 80-81 के लिए उक्त धारा के प्रयोजनार्थ अधिसूचित करती है।

[सं० 3168/फा० सं० 197/127/79 आ० क० (ए1)]

New Delhi, the 29th January, 1980

(INCOME TAX)

S.O. 1272.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (V) of sub-section (23c) of section 10 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby notifies ‘Malankara Marthoma Syrian Church and the parishes and institutions under it’ for the purpose of the said section for the assessment year (s) 1978-79, 79-80 and 80-81.

[No. 3168/F. No. 197/127/79-IT(AI)]

नई दिल्ली, 12 मार्च, 1980

आय-कर

फा० आ० 1273.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, आय-कर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (23-ग) के खण्ड (5) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, “श्री रंगम श्रीमत्त एनदावत पारिशद धर्म” का निर्धारण वर्ष 1980-81 के लिए उक्त धारा के प्रयोजनार्थ अधिसूचित करती है।

[सं० 3208/फा० सं० 197/24/80 आ० क० (ए1)]

New Delhi, the 12th April, 1980

(INCOME-TAX)

S.O. 1273.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (v) of sub-section (23C) of section 10 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby notifies "Srirangam Srimad Anjavan Periaswaram", for the purpose of the said section for the assessment year 1980-81.

[No. 3208/F. No. 197/24/80-IT(AD)]

क्र० आ० 1274—केन्द्रीय सरकार आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (23-क) के खण्ड (5) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए "कुरुक्षेत्र विकास बोर्ड" कुरुक्षेत्र की निर्धारण वर्ष 1969-70 से 1980-81 तक के लिए उक्त धारा के प्रावधानों के अधीन प्रत्यक्ष कर करती है।

[सं. 3210/फा० सं. 197/24/80-आ० सं. (ए1)]

S.O. 1274.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (v) of sub-section (23C) of section 10 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) the Central Government hereby notifies "Kurukshetra Development Board, Kurukshetra" for the purpose of the said section for the assessment year(s) 1969-70 to 1980-81.

[No. 3210/F. No. 197/45/79 IT(AD)]

क्र० आ० 1275—केन्द्रीय सरकार, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (23-क) के खण्ड (5) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए "गीता भवन ट्रस्ट, मोगा" की निर्धारण वर्ष 1978-79, 1979-80 और 1980-81 के लिए उक्त धारा के प्रावधानों के अधीन प्रत्यक्ष कर करती है।

[सं. 3212/फा० सं. 197/137/79-आ० सं. (ए1)]
श्री एम० सिंह, सचिव

S.O. 1275.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (v) of sub-section (23C) of section 10 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby notifies "Gita Bhawan Trust, Moga" for the purpose of the said section for the assessment year (s) 1978-79, 1979-80 and 1980-81.

[No. 3212/F. No. 197/137/79-IT(AD)]

B. M. SINGH, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 22 जनवरी, 1980

आय-कर

क्र० आ० 1276—आयकर अधिनियम 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (44) के उपखण्ड (iii) का अनुसरण करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा भारत सरकार के राजस्व विभाग का दिनांक 29 अगस्त, 1978 की अधिसूचना संख्या 2488 (क्र० सं० 404/28/78-आ० सं० सं०) में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् उक्त अधिसूचना में "श्री जी० ए० कानुंगा और श्री आर० जे० शाह" शब्दों और अक्षरों के स्थान पर "श्री आर० जे० शाह" शब्द और अक्षर प्रतिस्थापित किये जायेंगे।

[सं० 3152/फा० सं० 398/1 (क्र० सं० आ० गुजरात/80-आ० सं० सं०)]

New Delhi, the 22nd January, 1980

(INCOME-TAX)

S.O. 1276.—In pursuance of sub clause (iii) of clause (44) of Section 2 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Department of Revenue No. 2488 (F.No. 404/26/78-ITCC) dated 29-8-1978 namely: in the said Notification for the

words and letters "S/Shri G. A. Kanunga and R. J. Shah" the words and letters "Shri R. J. Shah" shall be substituted.

[No. 3152/F. No. 398/1/TRO-GUJ]80-ITCC]

क्र० आ० 1277—आयकर अधिनियम 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (44) के उपखण्ड (iii) का अनुसरण करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा श्री पी० एम० राधोद को, जो कि केन्द्रीय सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी हैं, उक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत कर वसूली अधिकारों की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

2. यह अधिसूचना श्री पी० एम० राधोद द्वारा कर वसूली अधिकारों के रूप में कार्यभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से लागू होगी।

[सं० 3150/फा० सं० 398/1/क्र० सं० गुजरात/80-आ० सं० सं०]

S.O. 1277.—In pursuance of sub-clause (iii) of clause (44) of Section 2 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby authorises Shri P. S. Rathod being a gazetted Officer of the Central Government, to exercise the powers of a Tax Recovery Officer under the said Act.

2. This Notification shall come into force with effect from the date Shri P. S. Rathod takes over charge as Tax Recovery Officer.

[No. 3150/F. No. 398/1/TRO-GUJ]80-ITCC]

नई दिल्ली, 10 अप्रैल 1980

आय-कर

क्र० आ० 1278—आयकर अधिनियम 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (44) के उपखण्ड (iii) का अनुसरण करते हुए तथा दिनांक 31-5-79 की अधिसूचना सं० 2834 [फा० सं० 404/118 (क्र० सं० आ० ए० पी०/79-आ० सं० सं०)] का अधिलेखन करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री पी० वेंकटेश्वरन् और श्री सी० प्रसाद राव को, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी हैं, अधिनियम के अधीन कर वसूली अधिकारों की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

2. यह अधिसूचना श्री पी० वेंकटेश्वरन् और श्री सी० प्रसाद राव के कर वसूली अधिकारों के रूप में कार्यभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से लागू होगी।

[सं० 3237/फा० सं० 404/118/क्र० सं० गुजरात/80-आ० सं० सं०]

New Delhi, the 10th April, 1980

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 1278.—In pursuance of sub-clause (iii) of clause (44) of Section 2 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) and in supersession of Notification No. 2834 [F. No. 404/118-TRO-AP] 79-ITCC] dt. 31-5-79 the Central Government hereby authorises S/Shri P. Venkateswarlu and Ch. Prasada Rao being gazetted Officers of the Central Government, to exercise the powers of Tax Recovery Officers under the said Act.

2. This Notification shall come into force with effect from the date S/Shri P. Venkateswarlu and Ch. Prasada Rao take over charge as Tax Recovery Officers.

[No. 3237/F. No. 404/118(TRO-AP)/79-ITCC]

क्र० आ० 1279—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (44) के उपखण्ड (iii) का अनुसरण करते हुए तथा दिनांक 31-5-79 की अधिसूचना सं० 2836 [फा० सं० 404/118 (क्र० सं० आ० ए० पी०)/79-आ० सं० सं०] का अधिलेखन करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री डी० आर० रामचन्द्र को, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी हैं उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन कर वसूली अधिकारों की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

2. यह अधिसूचना श्री डी० आर० रामचन्द्र के कर बसूली अधिकारी के रूप में कार्यभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से लागू होगी।

[सं० 3239 (फा० सं० 404/118(क०ख०अ०-ए०पी०)/79-आ०क०म०क०)]

S.O. 1279.—In pursuance of sub-clause (iii) of clause (44) of Section 2 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), and in supersession of Notification No. 2836(F. No. 404/118-(TRO-AP/79-ITCC) dt. 31-5-79 the Central Government hereby authorises Shri D. R. Ramchander being a gazetted Officer of the Central Government, to exercise the powers of a Tax Recovery Officer under the said Act.

2. This Notification shall come into force with effect from the date Shri D. R. Ramchander takes over charge as Tax Recovery Officer.

[No. 3239(F. No. 404/118(TRO-AP)/79-ITCC)]

फा० आ० 1280—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (44) के उपखण्ड (iii) का अनुसरण करते हुए तथा दिनांक 21-9-80 की अधिसूचना सं० 2517 (फा० सं० 404/90/77-आ०क०म०क०) का अधिलिखन करने हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री एन० जयकार को, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी हैं उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन, कर बसूली अधिकारी की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

2. यह अधिसूचना श्री जयकार के कर बसूली अधिकारी के रूप में कार्यभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से लागू होगी।

[सं० 3241 (फा० सं० 404/118(क०ख०अ०-ए०पी०)/79-आ०क०म०क०)]

S.O. 1280.—In pursuance of sub-clause (iii) of clause (44) of Section 2 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), and in supersession of Notification No. 2517 (F. No. 404/90/77-ITCC) dt. 21-9-80 the Central Government hereby authorises Shri N. Jayakar being a gazetted Officer, the Central Government to exercise the powers of a Tax Recovery Officer under the said Act.

2. This Notification shall come into force with effect from the date Shri Jayakar takes over charge as Tax Recovery Officer.

[No. 3241 (F. No. 404/118(TRO-AP)/79-ITCC)]

फा० आ० 1281—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 2 के खण्ड (44) के उप खण्ड (iii) का अनुसरण करते हुए तथा दिनांक 5-2-1980 की अधिसूचना सं० 3172 (फा० सं० 398/3/80 आ० क० सं० क०) का अधिलिखन करने हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री पी० सी० शर्मा को जो केन्द्रीय सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी हैं, उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन, कर बसूली अधिकारी की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

2. यह अधिसूचना श्री पी० सी० शर्मा के कर बसूली अधिकारी के रूप में कार्यभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से लागू होगी।

[सं० 3247 (फा० सं० 398/3/80-आ० क० सं० क०)]

एच० वेंकटरामन, उप सचिव

S.O. 1281.—In pursuance of sub-clause (iii) of clause (44) of Section 2 of the Income-tax Act, 1961, and in supersession of Notification No. 3172 (F. No. 398/3/80-ITCC) dt. 5-2-1980 the Central Government hereby authorises Shri P. C. Sharma being a Gazetted Officer of the Central Government, to exercise the powers of a Tax Recovery Officer under the said Act.

2. This Notification shall come into force with effect from the date Shri P. C. Sharma takes over as Tax Recovery Officer.

[No. 3247 (F. No. 398/3/80-ITCC)]

H. VENKATARAMAN, Dy. Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 29 जनवरी, 1980

शुद्धि-पत्र

आय-कर

फा० आ० 1282—राजस्व विभाग अधिसूचना सं० 2930 (फा० सं० 203/84/79-आ० क० अ० II) तारीख 13-7-79 में निम्नानुसार संशोधन करना है :-

“पूर्ण होने की तारीख 30-6-1981” के स्थान पर “पूर्ण होने की तारीख 30-6-1982” पढ़ें।

[सं० 3161 (फा० सं० 203/84/79-आ०क०अ०II)]

New Delhi, the 29th January, 1980

CORRIGENDUM

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 1282.—The Department of Revenue hereby amend the Notification No. 2930 (F. No. 203/84/79-ITA. II) dated 13-7-79 as under :—

For
Date of completion
30-6-1981.

Read
Date of completion
30-6-1982.

[No. 3161(F. No. 203/84/79-ITA. II)]

नई दिल्ली, 5 फरवरी, 1980

फा० आ० 1283.—सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि सचिव, विज्ञान और प्रौद्योगिकी विभाग, नई दिल्ली ने, आयकर नियम 1962 के नियम, 6 (4) के साथ पठित आय-कर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा 2 (क) के प्रयोजन के लिए निम्नलिखित वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान कार्यक्रम को नीचे विनिर्दिष्ट अवधि के लिए अनुमोदित किया है :
वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान कार्यक्रम एन-ट्राईडेसिलडिमोप्रोनोलामाइन की जानकारी का विकास।
का नाम :
प्रायोजक का नाम :
श्री ए एम एक इंडिया लिमिटेड,
मेवेकर हाउस : सूदन कालू अहिर
मार्ग, मुंबई।

कार्यन्वयन करने वाली प्रयोगशाला रा० रा० प्र० पुणे
आरम्भ करने की प्रस्तापित तारीख अक्टूबर, 79
पूरा करने की तारीख : आरम्भ करने की तारीख से 1 वर्ष
आवर्तित व्यय : 1,27,000 रु०

2. राष्ट्रीय रासायनिक प्रयोगशाला, पुणे वी० आ० अ० ए० जो आय-कर अधिनियम, 1922 की धारा 10(2) (xiii) के अधीन अनुमोदित है की एक एकक है।

[सं० 3174 (फा० सं० 203/21/80-आईटीए II)]

New Delhi, the 5th February, 1980

S.O. 1283.—It is hereby notified for general information that the following scientific research programme has been approved for the period specified below for the purposes of sub-section (2A) of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 read with Rule 6(iv) of the Income-tax Rules, 1962 by the Secretary, Department of Science & Technology, New Delhi:

Name of the Scientific Research Programme :	Development of know-how for N-Tridecyldisopropenolamine
Name of the sponsor :	BASF India Ltd., Maybakar House, Sudan Kalu Ahire Marg, Bombay.

Implementing Laboratory : N.C.L. Poona.
 Proposed date of commencement :— October, 1979
 Proposed date of completion : one year from the date of starting.
 Estimated Outlay : Rs. 1,27,000

2. The Central Chemical Laboratory, Poona is a unit of C.S.I.R. which stands approved u/s. 10(2) (xiii) of the Income-tax Act, 1962.

[No. 3174 (F. No. 203/21/80-ITA. II)]

का० आ० 1284.—सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि विहित प्राधिकारी, अर्थात् सचिव, विज्ञान और प्रौद्योगिकी विभाग नई दिल्ली ने निम्नलिखित संस्था को आयकर नियम, 1962 के नियम 6(iv) के साथ पठित, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उप धारा (1) के खण्ड (2) के प्रयोजनों के लिए अन्य प्राकृति या आनु-प्रयोगिक विज्ञान के क्षेत्र में 'संगम' प्रवर्ग के अधीन निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर अनुमोदित किया है, अर्थात्:—

- (1) यह कि वर्षा वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान प्रतिष्ठान प्राकृतिक या आनु-प्रयोगिक (कृषि पशुपालन मत्स्य की और औषधि से भिन्न) विज्ञान के क्षेत्र में वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान के लिए प्राप्त राशियों का हिसाब पृथक् से रखेगा।
- (2) उक्त प्रतिष्ठान प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संबंधी क्रियाकलापों की एक वार्षिक विवरणी विहित प्राधिकारी को प्रति वर्ष 30 अप्रैल तक ऐसे प्रारूपों में प्रस्तुत करेगा जो इस प्रयोजन के लिए अधिवर्धित किये जाएं और उसे सूचित किए जाएं।

संस्था

घर्दा वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान प्रतिष्ठान, मुम्बई

यह अधिसूचना 8-1-80 से 7-1-1983 तक 3 वर्ष की अवधि के लिए प्रवृत्त होगी।

[सं० 3176 का० सं० 203/152/77-आई टी ए (2)]

S.O. 1284.—It is hereby notified for general information that the institution mentioned below has been approved by the Secretary, Department of Science and Technology, New Delhi, the prescribed authority for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961, read with Rule 6(iv) of the Income-tax Rules, 1962 under the category "Association" in the area of other natural or applied sciences, subject to the following conditions:—

- (i) that the Gharda Scientific Research Foundation will maintain a separate account of the sums received by it for scientific research in the field of natural or applied sciences (other than agriculture/animal husbandry/fisheries and medicines).
- (ii) That the said Foundation will furnish the annual return of its scientific research activities to the Prescribed Authority for every financial year in such forms as may be laid down and intimated to them for this purpose, by 30th April, each year.

INSTITUTION

GHARDA SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH FOUNDATION,
BOMBAY

This notification is effective for a period of 3 years from 8-1-80 to 7-1-1983.

[No. 3176/F. No. 203/152/77-ITA.II]

नई दिल्ली, 7 फरवरी, 1980

आय-कर

का० आ० 1285.—इस विभाग की अधिसूचना सं० 2103 (का० सं० 203/142/77-आ० क० अ० 2) तारीख 4 जनवरी, 1978 के पत्राचार में सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए यह अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि विहित प्राधिकारी, अर्थात् भारतीय चिकित्सा अनुसंधान परिषद् ने निम्नलिखित संस्था को, आयकर नियम, 1962 के नियम 6 (2) के साथ पठित आयकर अधिनियम 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (2) के प्रयोजनों के लिए चिकित्सा अनुसंधान के क्षेत्र में "वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संगम" प्रवर्ग के अधीन निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर अनुमोदित किया है, अर्थात्:—

- (1) यह कि सोसाइटी चिकित्सा अनुसंधान के क्षेत्र में वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान के लिए प्राप्त राशियों का हिसाब पृथक् से रखेगी।
- (2) सोसाइटी, अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संबंधी क्रियाकलापों की एक वार्षिक विवरणी परिषद् को प्रति वर्ष अधिक से अधिक 31 मई तक ऐसे प्रारूप में प्रस्तुत करेगी जो इस प्रयोजन के लिए अधिवर्धित किए जाएं और उसे सूचित किए जाएं।
- (3) सोसाइटी प्रत्येक वर्ष के लेखे की लेखापरीक्षित वार्षिक विवरणी की एक प्रति प्रत्येक वर्ष 31 मई तक परिषद् को भेजेगी और इसके अनिवार्यतः उसकी एक प्रति सम्बद्ध आय-कर आयुक्त को भी भेजेगी।

संस्था

गोआ कैंसर सोसाइटी, गोआ

यह अधिसूचना 4-10-79 से 3-10-1982 तक 3 वर्ष की अवधि के लिए प्रवृत्त होगी।

[सं० 3179 (का० सं० 203/26/80-आई टी ए 2)]

New Delhi, the 7th February, 1980

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 1285.—In continuation of this Department's Notification No. 2103 (F. No. 203/142/77-ITA. II) dated 4th January, 1978, it is hereby notified for general information that the institution mentioned below has been approved by the Indian Council of Medical Research, the prescribed authority for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961, read with Rule 6(ii) of the Income-tax Rules, 1962 under the category of "Scientific Research Association" in the field of medical research, subject to the following conditions:—

- (i) That the Society will maintain a separate account of the sums received by it for scientific research in the field of medical research.
- (ii) That the Society will furnish annual returns of its scientific research activities to the council for each year by 31st May, each year at the latest in such form as may be laid down and intimated to them for this purpose.
- (iii) That the Society will furnish a copy of the annual audited statement of accounts to the council for each year by 31st May each year and in addition send a copy of it to the concerned income-tax Commissioner.

INSTITUTION

GOA, CANCER SOCIETY, GOA

This notification is effective for a period of 3 years from 4-10-79 to 3-10-1982.

[No. 3179/F. No. 203/26/80-ITA.II]

नई दिल्ली, 8 फरवरी 1980

का०आ० 1286.—इस विभाग की अधिसूचना सं० 2111, तारीख 6 जनवरी 1978 के क्रम में सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि विहित प्राधिकारी अर्थात् भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद् ने निम्नलिखित संस्था को आय-कर नियम, 1962 के नियम 6(ii) के साथ पठित आय-कर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के प्रयोजनों के लिए चिकित्सकीय अनुसंधान के क्षेत्र में "वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संगम" प्रवर्ग के अधीन निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर अनुमोदित किया है, अर्थात्:—

- (i) यह कि लायन्स कैंसर अभिज्ञान केंद्र न्यास चिकित्सकीय अनुसंधान के क्षेत्र में वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान के लिए प्राप्त राशियों का हिसाब पुस्तक से रखेगा।
- (ii) उक्त लायन्स कैंसर अभिज्ञान केंद्र न्यास प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संबंधी क्रिया कलापों की एक वार्षिक विवरणो परिषद् को प्रति वर्ष 31 मई तक ऐसे प्ररूपों में करेगा जो इस प्रयोजन के लिए अधिकृत किए जाएं और उसे सूचित किए जाएं।
- (iii) उक्त लायन्स कैंसर अभिज्ञान केंद्र न्यास प्रत्येक वर्ष के लिए लेखाओं के वार्षिक संपरीक्षित विवरण की एक प्रति परिषद् को प्रति वर्ष 31 मई तक प्रस्तुत करेगा और इसके अतिरिक्त उसकी एक प्रति सम्बद्ध आय-कर आयुक्त को भेजेगा।

संस्था

लायन्स कैंसर अभिज्ञान केंद्र न्यास, सुरत

यह अधिसूचना 19-11-1979 से 18-11-82 तक 3 वर्ष की अवधि के लिए प्रवृत्त होगी।

[सं० 3184/का०सं० 203/25/80-आई टी ए-II]

New Delhi, the 8th February, 1980

S.O. 1286.—In continuation of this Department's Notification No. 2111 dated 6th January, 1978, it is hereby notified for general information that the institution mentioned below has been approved by the Indian Council of Medical Research the prescribed authority for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961, read with Rule 6(ii) of the Income-tax Rules, 1962 under the category of "Scientific research association" in the field of medical research, subject to the following conditions:—

- (i) That the Lions Cancer Detection Centre Trust, will maintain a separate account of the sums received by it for scientific research in the field of medical research.
- (ii) That the Lions Cancer Detection Centre Trust, will furnish annual returns of its scientific research activities to the council for each year by 31st May, each year at the latest in such form as may be laid down and intimated to them for this purpose.
- (iii) That the Lions Cancer Detection Centre Trust, will furnish a copy of the annual audited statement of accounts to the council for each year by 31st May each year and in addition send a copy of it to the concerned Income-tax Commissioner.

INSTITUTION

LIONS CANCER DETECTION CENTRE TRUST, SURAT.

This notification is effective for a period of 3 years from 19-11-79 to 18-11-1982.

[No. 3184/F. No. 203/25/80-ITA-II]

85 GJ/80—3

का०आ० 1287.—इस विभाग की अधिसूचना सं० 1713 (का० सं० 203/41/77-आई टी ए II), तारीख 5-4-1977 के क्रम सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि विहित प्राधिकारी, अर्थात् भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद् ने निम्नलिखित संस्था को आय-कर नियम, 1962 के नियम 6(ii) के साथ पठित आय-कर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के प्रयोजनों के लिए चिकित्सकीय अनुसंधान के क्षेत्र में "वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संगम" प्रवर्ग के अधीन निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर अनुमोदित किया है, अर्थात्:—

- (i) यह कि संस्था चिकित्सकीय अनुसंधान के क्षेत्र में वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान के लिए प्राप्त राशियों का हिसाब पुस्तक से रखेगा।
- (ii) उक्त संस्था प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संबंधी क्रिया कलापों की एक वार्षिक विवरणो परिषद् को प्रति वर्ष 31 मई तक ऐसे प्ररूपों में प्रस्तुत करेगा जो इस प्रयोजन के लिए अधिकृत किए जाएं और उसे सूचित किए जाएं।
- (iii) उक्त संस्था प्रत्येक वर्ष के लिए लेखाओं के वार्षिक संपरीक्षित विवरण की एक प्रति परिषद् को प्रति वर्ष 31 मई तक प्रस्तुत करेगा और इसके अतिरिक्त उसकी एक प्रति सम्बद्ध आय-कर आयुक्त को भेजेगा।

संस्था

श्री गोविन्द प्रसाद वैद्य शस्तिपूति आयुर्वेद संशोधन विज्ञान भवन ट्रस्ट, अहमदाबाद

यह अधिसूचना 5-4-1979 से 4-4-1982 तक 3 वर्ष की अवधि के लिए प्रवृत्त होगी।

[सं० 3185/का०सं० 203/176/79-आई टी ए-II]

S.O. 1287.—In continuation of this Department's Notification No. 1713 (F. No. 203/41/77-ITA. II) dated 5-4-1977, it is hereby notified for general information that the institution mentioned below has been approved by the Indian Council of Medical Research, the prescribed authority for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961, read with Rule 6(ii) of the Income-tax Rules, 1962 under the category of "Scientific research association" in the field of medical research, subject to the following conditions:—

- (i) That the Institute will maintain a separate account of the sums received by it for scientific research in the field of medical research.
- (ii) That the Institute will furnish annual returns of its scientific research activities to the council for each year by 31st May, each year at the latest in such form as may be laid down and intimated to them for this purpose.
- (iii) That the Institute will furnish a copy of the annual audited statement of accounts to the council for each year by 31st May each year and in addition send a copy of it to the concerned Income-tax Commissioner.

INSTITUTION

SHRI GOVIND PRASAD VAIDYA SHASHTIPURTI AYURVEDA SANSHODHAN VIGYAN BHAVAN TRUST, AHMEDABAD.

This notification is effective for a period of 3 years from 5-4-1979 to 4-4-1982.

[No. 3185/F. No. 203/176/79-ITA-II]

नई दिल्ली, 19 फरवरी, 1980

नई दिल्ली, 28 फरवरी, 1980

क्र.सं. 1288.—इस विभाग की अधिसूचना सं. 2230, तारीख 28-3-78 के अन्तर्गत में सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि विहित प्राधिकारी, अर्थात्, भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान अनुसंधान परिषद, नई दिल्ली ने निम्नलिखित संस्था को आय-कर नियम 1962 के नियम 6(ii) के साथ पठित, आय-कर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (i) के खण्ड (ii) के प्रयोजनों के लिए चिकित्सा अनुसंधान के क्षेत्र में "वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संगम" प्रवर्ग के अधीन निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर अनुमोदित किया है, अर्थात्:—

- (i) यह कि संस्थान चिकित्सा अनुसंधान क्षेत्र में वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान के लिए प्राप्त राशियों का हिस्सा पृथक् रूप से रखेगा।
- (ii) उक्त संस्थान प्रत्येक वर्ष के लिए अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संबंधी क्रिया कलापों की वार्षिक परिषद को प्रति वर्ष अधिक से अधिक 31 मई तक ऐसे प्रारूपों में प्रस्तुत करेगा जो इस प्रयोजन के लिए अधिकृत किए जाएं और उमें सूचित किए जाएं।
- (iii) उक्त संस्थान प्रत्येक वर्ष के लिए लेखाओं का वार्षिक संपरीक्षित विवरण परिषद को प्रति वर्ष 31 मई तक भेजेगा और इसके अनतिरिक्त इसकी एक प्रति सम्बद्ध आय-कर अधिकृत को भेजेगा।

संस्था

जी० कृष्णस्वामी नायडू मेमोरियल हॉस्पिटल, कोयम्बटूर।

यह अधिसूचना 27-12-1979 से 26-12-1982 तक तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी होगी।

[सं० 3190 फा०सं० 203/36/80-आई टी ए-II]

New Delhi, the 19th February, 1980

S.O. 1288.—In continuation of this Department's Notification No. 2230 dated 28-3-1978, it is hereby notified for general information that the institution mentioned below has been approved by Indian Council of Medical Research, New Delhi, the prescribed authority for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 read with Rule 6(ii) of the Income-tax Rules, 1962 under the category of "scientific research association" in the field of Medical Research, subject to the following conditions:—

- (i) That the institute will maintain a separate account of the sums received by it for scientific research in the field of medical research.
- (ii) That the institute will furnish annual returns of its scientific research activities to the Council for each year by 31st May each year at the latest in such form as may be laid down and intimated to them for this purpose.
- (iii) That the institute will furnish an annual audited statement of accounts to the Council for each year by 31st May, each year and in addition send a copy of it to the concerned Income-tax Commissioner.

INSTITUTION

G. KUPPUSWAMY NAIDU MEMORIAL HOSPITAL, COIMBATORE.

This notification is effective for a period of three years from 27-12-1979 to 26-12-1982.

[No. 3190/F. No. 203/36/80-ITA-II]

क्र.सं. 1289.—इस विभाग की अधिसूचना सं. 2030 तारीख 29-10-78 के तहत में सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि विहित प्राधिकारी, अर्थात् भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान अनुसंधान परिषद ने निम्नलिखित संस्था को आय-कर नियम, 1962 के नियम 6(ii) के साथ पठित, आय-कर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के प्रयोजनों के लिए चिकित्सा अनुसंधान के क्षेत्र में "वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संगम" प्रवर्ग के अधीन निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर अनुमोदित किया है, अर्थात्:—

- (1) यह कि संस्था, चिकित्सा अनुसंधान के क्षेत्र में वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान के लिए प्राप्त राशियों का हिस्सा पृथक् रूप से रखेगी।
- (2) उक्त संस्था प्रत्येक वर्ष के लिए अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संबंधी क्रिया कलापों की एक वार्षिक विवरणी विहित प्राधिकारी को प्रति वर्ष 31 मई तक ऐसे प्रारूप में प्रस्तुत करेगी जो इस प्रयोजन के लिए अधिकृत किया जाए और सूचित किया जाए।
- (3) उक्त संस्था प्रत्येक वर्ष के लिए परिषद के लेखाओं के वार्षिक संपरीक्षित विवरण की एक प्रति वर्ष 31 मई तक प्रस्तुत करेगी और इसके अनतिरिक्त उसकी एक प्रति सम्बद्ध आयकर अधिकृत को भेजेगी।

संस्था

श्री कल्याण आरोग्य सदन, बाजाज ग्राम, सीकर (राजस्थान)

यह अधिसूचना 29-10-79 से 28-10-1982 तक 3 वर्ष की अवधि के लिए प्रवृत्त होगी।

[सं० 3194/203/152/79-आई टी ए-II]

New Delhi, the 28th February, 1980

S.O. 1289.—In continuation of this Department's Notification No. 2030 dated 29-10-77, it is hereby notified for general information that the institution mentioned below has been approved by the Indian Council of Medical Research, the prescribed authority for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961, read with Rule 6(ii) of the Income-tax Rules, 1962 under the category of "Scientific research association" in the field of medical research, subject to the following conditions:—

- (1) That the Institution will maintain a separate account of the sums received by it for scientific research in the field of medical research.
- (2) That the Institution will furnish annual returns of its scientific research activities to the council for each year by 31st May, each year at the latest in such form as may be laid down and intimated to them for this purpose.
- (3) That the Institution will furnish a copy of the annual audited statement of accounts to the Council for each year by 31st May each year and in addition send a copy of it to the concerned Income-tax Commissioner.

INSTITUTION

SHRI KALYAN AROGYA SADAN, BAJAJGRAM, SIKAR (RAJASTHAN).

This notification is effective for a period of 3 years from 29-10-79 to 28-10-1982.

[No. 3194/F. No. 203/152/79-ITA. II]

कां० 1290.—इस विभाग की अधिसूचना सं० 2228, तारीख 23-3-78 के अनुक्रम में सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि विहित प्राधिकारी, अर्थात् भारतीय चिकित्सा अनुसंधान परिषद, ने निम्नलिखित संस्था को आयकर नियम, 1962 के नियम 6(ii) के साथ पठित, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (i) के खण्ड (ii) के प्रयोजनों के लिए चिकित्सा अनुसंधान के क्षेत्र में "वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संगम" प्रवर्ग के अधीन निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर अनुमोदित किया है, अर्थात्:—

- (i) यह कि संस्थान चिकित्सा अनुसंधान के क्षेत्र में वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान के लिए प्राप्त राशियों का हिसाब पृथक रूप से रखेगा।
- (ii) उक्त संस्थान प्रत्येक वर्ष के लिए अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संबंधी क्रिया कलापों की वार्षिक विवरणी परिषद को प्रति वर्ष अधिक से अधिक 31 मई तक ऐसे प्ररूपों में प्रस्तुत करेगा जो इस प्रयोजन के लिए अधिकृत किए जाएं और उसे सूचित किया जाए।
- (iii) उक्त संस्थान प्रत्येक वर्ष के लिए लेखाओं का वार्षिक संपरीक्षित विवरण परिषद को प्रति वर्ष 31 मई तक भेजेगा और इसके अतिरिक्त इसकी एक प्रति सम्बद्ध आयकर आयुक्त को भेजेगा।

संस्था

प्रखिल भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान संस्थान, नई दिल्ली

यह अधिसूचना 24-12-1979 से 23-12-1982 तक तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी होगी।

[सं० 3195/का०सं० 203/33/80-आई टी ए-II]

S.O. 1290.—In continuation of this Department's Notification No. 2228 dated 23rd March, 1978, it is hereby notified for general information that the institution mentioned below has been approved by the Indian Council of Medical Research, the prescribed authority for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961, read with Rule 6(ii) of the Income-tax Rules, 1962 under the category of "Scientific Research Association" in the field of medical research, subject to the following conditions:—

- (i) That the institute will maintain a separate account of the sums received by it for scientific research in the field of medical research.
- (ii) That the institute will furnish annual returns of its scientific research activities to the council for each year by 31st May, each year at the latest in such form as may be laid down and intimated to them for this purpose.
- (iii) That the institute will furnish a copy of the annual audited statement of accounts to the council for each year by 31st May each year and in addition send a copy of it to the concerned Income-tax Commissioner.

INSTITUTION

ALL INDIA INSTITUTE OF MEDICAL SCIENCES, NEW DELHI.

This notification is effective for a period of 3 years from 24-12-1979 to 23-12-1982.

[No. 3195/F. No. 203/33/1980-ITA-II]

कां० 1291.—इस विभाग की अधिसूचना सं० 2138, तारीख 28-1-78 के अनुक्रम में सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि विहित प्राधिकारी, अर्थात् भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान अनुसंधान परिषद, ने निम्नलिखित संस्था को आयकर नियम,

1962 के नियम 6(ii) के साथ पठित, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (i) के खण्ड (ii) के प्रयोजनों के लिए चिकित्सा अनुसंधान के क्षेत्र में "वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संगम" प्रवर्ग के अधीन निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर अनुमोदित किया है, अर्थात्:—

- (i) यह कि सोसाइटी, चिकित्सा अनुसंधान के क्षेत्र में वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान के लिए प्राप्त राशियों का हिसाब पृथक रूप से रखेगी।
- (ii) उक्त सोसाइटी प्रत्येक वर्ष के लिए अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संबंधी क्रिया कलापों की वार्षिक विवरणी परिषद को प्रति वर्ष 31 मई तक ऐसे प्ररूपों में प्रस्तुत करेगी जो इस प्रयोजन के लिए अधिकृत किए जाएं और उसे सूचित किया जाए।
- (iii) उक्त संस्था प्रत्येक वर्ष के लिए लेखाओं का वार्षिक संपरीक्षित विवरण परिषद को प्रति वर्ष 31 मई तक भेजेगी और इसके अतिरिक्त इसकी एक प्रति सम्बद्ध आयकर आयुक्त को भेजेगी।

संस्था

मंगलोर मेडिकल रिलीफ सोसाइटी (रजि०) मंगलोर

यह अधिसूचना 27-12-1979 से 26-12-1982 तक 3 वर्ष की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी होगी।

[सं० 3196/का०सं० 203/37/80-आई टी ए-II]

S.O. 1291.—In continuation of this Department's Notification No. 2138 dated 28th January, 1978, it is hereby notified for general information that the institution mentioned below has been approved by the Indian Council of Medical Research, the prescribed authority for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961, read with Rule 6(ii) of the Income-tax Rules, 1962 under the category of "Scientific Research Association" in the field of medical research, subject to the following conditions:—

1. That the society will maintain a separate account of the sums received by it for scientific research in the field of medical research.
2. That the Society will furnish annual returns of its scientific research activities to the council for each year by 31st May, each year at the latest in such form as may be laid down and intimated to them for this purpose.
3. That the Society will furnish a copy of the annual audited statement of accounts to the Council for each year by 31st May each year and in addition send a copy of it to the concerned Income-tax Commissioner.

INSTITUTION

MANGALORE MEDICAL RELIEF SOCIETY (REGD.) MANGALORE.

This notification is effective for a period of 3 years from 27-12-1979 to 26-12-1982.

[No. 3196/F. No. 203/37/1980-ITA-II]

कां० 1292.—इस विभाग की अधिसूचना सं० 2246, तारीख 31-3-78 के अनुक्रम में सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि विहित प्राधिकारी, अर्थात् भारतीय चिकित्सा अनुसंधान परिषद, ने निम्नलिखित संस्था को आयकर नियम, 1962 के नियम 6(ii) के साथ पठित, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (i) के खण्ड (ii) के प्रयोजनों के लिए

चिकित्सा अनुसंधान के क्षेत्र में "वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संगम" प्रवर्ग के अधीन निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर अनुमोदित किया है, अर्थात्:—

- (i) यह कि संस्था चिकित्सा अनुसंधान के क्षेत्र में वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान के लिए प्राप्त राशियों का हिसाब पृथक् रूप से रखेगी।
- (ii) उक्त संस्था प्रत्येक वर्ष के लिए अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान सम्बन्धी क्रियाकलापों की वार्षिक विवरणी परिषद को प्रति वर्ष अधिक से अधिक 31 मई तक ऐसे प्रारूपों में प्रस्तुत करेगी जो इस प्रयोजन के लिए अधिकृत किए जाएं और उसे सूचित किए जाएं।
- (iii) उक्त संस्था प्रत्येक वर्ष के लिए लेखाओं का वार्षिक संपरीक्षित विवरण परिषद को प्रति वर्ष 31 मई तक भेजेगी और इसके अतिरिक्त इसकी एक प्रति सम्बद्ध आय-कर आयुक्त को भेजेगी।

संस्था

फाउण्डेशन फार मेडिकल रिसर्च, बाम्बे।

यह अधिसूचना 15-1-80 से 14-1-83 तक तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी होगी।

[सं० 3197/फा०सं० 203/35/80-आई टी ए-II]

S.O. 1292.—In continuation of this Department's Notification No. 22—6, dated 31-3-78, it is hereby notified for general information that the institution mentioned below has been approved by the Indian Council of Medical Research, the prescribed authority for the purposes of clause (u) of sub-section (1) of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961, read with Rule 6(ii) of the Income-tax Rules, 1962 under the category of "Scientific research association" in the field of medical research, subject to the following conditions :—

- (i) That the institution will maintain a separate account of of the sums received by it for scientific research in the field of medical research.
- (ii) That the institution will furnish annual returns of its scientific research activities to the council for each year by 31st May, each year at the latest in such form as may be laid down and intimated to them for this purpose.
- (iii) That the institution will furnish a copy of annual audited statement of accounts to the Council for each year by 31st May each year and in addition send a copy of it to the concerned Income-tax Commissioner.

INSTITUTION

Foundation for Medical Research, Bombay.

This notification is effective for a period of 3 years from 15-1-1980 to 14-1-1983.

[No. 3197/F. No. 203/35/80-ITA. II]

का० जा० 1293.—इस विभाग की अधिसूचना सं० 2167, तारीख 8 फरवरी, 1978 के अनुक्रम में सर्वे साधारण की जानकारी के लिए अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि विहित प्राधिकारी, अर्थात्, भारतीय चिकित्सा अनुसंधान परिषद, नई दिल्ली ने निम्नलिखित संस्था को आय-कर नियम, 1962 के नियम 6(ii) के साथ पठित, आय-कर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के प्रयोजनों के लिए चिकित्सा अनुसंधान के क्षेत्र में "वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संगम" प्रवर्ग के अधीन निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर अनुमोदित किया है, अर्थात्:—

- (i) यह कि संस्था चिकित्सा अनुसंधान के क्षेत्र में वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान के लिए प्राप्त राशियों का हिसाब पृथक् रूप से रखेगी।

(ii) उक्त संस्था प्रत्येक वर्ष के लिए अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संबंधी क्रियाकलापों की वार्षिक विवरणी परिषद को प्रति वर्ष अधिक से अधिक 31 मई तक ऐसे प्रारूपों में प्रस्तुत करेगी जो इस प्रयोजन के लिए अधिकृत किए जाएं और उसे सूचित किए जाएं।

(iii) उक्त संस्थान प्रत्येक वर्ष के लिए लेखाओं का वार्षिक संपरीक्षित विवरण परिषद को प्रति वर्ष 31 मई तक भेजेगी और इसके अतिरिक्त इसकी एक प्रति सम्बद्ध आय-कर आयुक्त को भेजेगी।

संस्था

चिल्ड्रन ओर्थोपेडिक हॉस्पिटल, बाम्बे।

यह अधिसूचना 27-12-1979 से 26-12-1982 तक तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी होगी।

[सं० 3198/फा०सं० 203/34/80 आई टी ए-II]

S.O. 1293.—In continuation of this Department's Notification No. 2167, dated 8th February, 1978, it is hereby notified for general information that the institution mentioned below has been approved by Indian Council of Medical Research, New Delhi, the prescribed authority for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 read with Rule 6(ii) of the Income-tax Rules, 1962 under the category of "Scientific Research Association" in the field of Medical Research, subject to the following conditions :—

- (i) That the institution will maintain a separate account of the sums received by it for scientific research in the field of medical research.
- (ii) That the institution will furnish annual returns of its scientific research activities to the Council for each year by 31st May each year at the latest in such form as may be laid down and intimated to them for this purpose.
- (iii) That the institution will furnish an annual audited statement of accounts to the Council for each year by 31st May each year and in addition send a copy of it to the concerned Income-tax Commissioner.

INSTITUTION

Children's Orthopedic Hospital, Bombay

This notification is effective for a period of three years from 27-12-1979 to 26-12-1982.

[No. 3190/F. No. 203/36/80-ITA-III]

नई दिल्ली, 4 मार्च, 1980

का० जा० 1294.—सर्वे साधारण की जानकारी के लिए अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि विहित प्राधिकारी, अर्थात्, भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान अनुसंधान परिषद, नई दिल्ली ने निम्नलिखित संस्था को आय-कर नियम, 1962 के नियम 6(ii) के साथ पठित, आय-कर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के प्रयोजनों के लिए चिकित्सा अनुसंधान के क्षेत्र में "वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संगम" प्रवर्ग के अधीन निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर अनुमोदित किया है, अर्थात्:—

(i) यह कि उक्त संस्था, चिकित्सा अनुसंधान के क्षेत्र में वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान के लिए प्राप्त राशियों का हिसाब पृथक् रूप से रखेगी।

(ii) उक्त संस्था प्रत्येक वर्ष के लिए अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संबंधी क्रियाकलापों की एक वार्षिक विवरणी विहित प्राधिकारी को प्रति वर्ष 31 मई तक ऐसे प्रारूपों में प्रस्तुत करेगी जो इस प्रयोजन के लिए अधिकृत किए जाएं और उसे सूचित किए जाएं।

- (iii) उक्त संस्था प्रत्येक वर्ष के लिए परिषद् को लेखाओं का एक वार्षिक संपरीक्षित विवरण प्रतिवर्ष 31 मई तक प्रस्तुत करेगी और इसके प्रतिरिक्त उसका एक प्रति सम्बद्ध आयुक्त आयुक्त को भेजीगी।

संस्था

चौ० अयाशी राम बत्ता लोक पूति न्यास, नई दिल्ली का चिकित्सा अनुसंधान केन्द्र और अस्पताल।

यह अधिसूचना 28-2-1980 से 27-2-1983 तक 3 वर्ष की अवधि के लिए प्रवृत्त होगी।

[न० 3202/फा० सं० 203/100/80-आई०टी०ए०-II]

New Delhi, the 4th March, 1980

S.O. 1294.—It is hereby notified for general information that the institution mentioned below has been approved by Indian Council of Medical Research, New Delhi, the prescribed authority for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 read with Rule 6(ii) of the Income-tax Rules, 1962 under the category of "Scientific research Association" in the field of Medical Research subject to the following conditions :—

- That the institution will maintain a separate account of the sums received by it for scientific research in the field of medical research.
- That the institution will furnish annual returns of its scientific research activities to the Council for each year by 31st May each year at the latest in such form as may be laid down and intimated to them for this purpose.
- That the institution will furnish an annual audited statement of accounts to the Council for each year by 31st May, each year and in addition send a copy of it to the concerned Income-tax Commissioner.

INSTITUTION

Medical Research Centre & Hospital of the Ch. Aishi Ram Batra Public Charitable Trust, New Delhi.

The notification is effective for a period of three years from 28-2-1980 to 27-2-1983.

[S. No. 3202/F. No. 203/100/80-ITA. II]

नई दिल्ली, 7 मार्च, 1980

का०आ० 1295—सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि विज्ञान प्राधिकारी, अर्थात्, भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान अनुसंधान परिषद्, नई दिल्ली ने निम्नलिखित संस्था को आयकर नियम, 1962 के नियम 6(ii) के साथ पठित आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के प्रयोजनों के लिए चिकित्सा अनुसंधान के क्षेत्र में "वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संगम" के अधीन निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर अनुमोदित किया है, अर्थात् :—

- यह कि संस्थान चिकित्सा अनुसंधान के क्षेत्र में वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान के लिए प्राप्त राशियों का हिस्सा पृथक् रूप से रखेगा।
- उक्त संस्थान प्रत्येक वर्ष के लिए अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संबंधी क्रिया-कलापों की वार्षिक विवरणी परिषद् को प्रति वर्ष 31 मई तक ऐसे प्रारूपों में प्रस्तुत करेगा जो इस प्रयोजन के लिए अधिकृत किए जाएं और उसे सूचित किए जाएं।
- उक्त संस्थान प्रत्येक वर्ष के लिए लेखाओं का वार्षिक संपरीक्षित विवरण परिषद् को प्रति वर्ष 31 मई तक भेजेगा और इसके प्रतिरिक्त इसकी एक प्रति सम्बद्ध आयकर आयुक्त को भेजेगा।

संस्था

ब्रीच कण्डी अस्पताल, मुम्बई

यह अधिसूचना 8-2-1980 से 7-2-1983 तक तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी होगी।

[स० 3204/फा० सं० 203/39/80-आई०टी०ए०-II]

New Delhi, the 7th March, 1980

S.O. 1295.—It is hereby notified for general information that the institution mentioned below has been approved by Indian Council of Medical Research, New Delhi, the prescribed authority for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 read with Rule 6(ii) of the Income-tax Rules, 1962 under the category of "scientific research association" in the field of Medical Research subject to the following conditions :—

- That the institute will maintain a separate account of the sums received by it for scientific research in the field of medical research.
- That the institute will furnish annual returns of its scientific research activities to the council for each year by 31st May each year at the latest in such form as may be laid down and intimated to them for this purpose.
- That the institute will furnish an annual audited statement of accounts to the Council for each year by 31st May, each year and in addition send a copy of it to the concerned Income-tax Commissioner.

INSTITUTION

Breach Candy Hospital, Bombay

The notification is effective for a period of three years from 8-2-1980 to 7-2-1983.

[No. 3204/F. No. 203/89/80-ITA. II]

का०आ० 1296—सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए सूचित किया जाता है कि सचिव, विज्ञान और प्रौद्योगिकी विभाग, नई दिल्ली ने आयकर नियम 1962 के नियम 6(iv) के साथ पठित आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (2क) के प्रयोजनों के लिए निम्नलिखित वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान कार्यक्रमों का नीचे विनिर्दिष्ट अवधि के लिए अनुमोदन कर दिया है :—

वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान कार्यक्रम का नाम	एलुमिना वाहक और कैटलिन एलुमिना उत्प्रेरक का विकास
आयोजक का नाम	इंडियन पेट्रोकेमिकल्स कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड, बड़ोदा
कार्यान्वित प्रयोगशाला	प्रादेशिक अनुसंधान प्रयोगशाला भुवनेश्वर।
प्रारम्भ करने की प्रस्तावित तारीख	24-8-1979
पूरा करने की प्रस्तावित तारीख	23-8-1980
प्राक्कलित व्यय	49,100 रु०

2. प्रादेशिक अनुसंधान प्रयोगशाला, भुवनेश्वर, सी०एस०आई०धार० की, जो आयकर अधिनियम, 1922 की धारा 10(2)(xiii) के अधीन अनुमोदित युनिट है।

[स० 3205/फा० सं० 203/92/80-आई०टी०ए० II]

S.O. 1296.—It is hereby notified for general information that the following scientific research programmes have been approved for the period specified below for the purposes of sub-section (2A) of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961

read with Rule 6(iv) of the Income-tax Rules, 1962 by the Secretary, Department of Science & Technology, New Delhi.

Name of the Scientific Research Programme : Development of alumina carrier and platinum alumina catalyst.

Name of the sponsor : Indian Petrochemicals Corpn. Ltd., Baroda.

Implementing Laboratory : Regional Research Laboratory, Bhuvaneshwar.

Proposed date of commencement : 24-8-1979.

Proposed date of completion : 23-8-1980.

Estimated Outlay : Rs. 49.100

2. The Regional Research Laboratory, Bhuvaneshwar is a unit of C.S.I.R. which stands approved under section 10(2) (xiii) of the Income-tax Act, 1922.

[No. 3205 /F. No. 203/92/80-ITA. II]

का०धा० 1297.—सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि विहित प्राधिकारी अर्थात् भारतीय समाज विज्ञान अनुसंधान परिषद ने निम्नलिखित संस्थान को आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (iii) के प्रयोजनों के लिए निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर अनुमोदित किया है :

- यह कि आदर्श शिक्षा और अनुसंधान संस्थान द्वारा इस छूट के अधीन संग्रहीत निधियों का उपयोग एकमात्र समाज विज्ञान के अनुसंधान की प्रोत्ति के लिये ही किया जाएगा।
- यह कि आदर्श शिक्षा और अनुसंधान संस्थान इस छूट के अधीन संग्रह की गई निधियों का हिसाब पृथक रूप से रखेगा।
- यह कि आदर्श शिक्षा और अनुसंधान संस्थान छूट के अधीन एकत्र की गई निधियों को और वह रीति, जिसमें उनका उपयोग किया गया है, दर्शाते हुए लेखाओं का वार्षिक विवरण और वार्षिक रिपोर्ट भारतीय समाज विज्ञान अनुसंधान परिषद तथा सम्बद्ध आयकर प्रायुक्त को भेजेगा।

संस्था

आदर्श शिक्षा और अनुसंधान संस्थान, जम्मू।

यह अधिसूचना 1-4-1980 से 31-3-1983 तक तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी रहेगी।

[सं० 3206/का०सं० 203/99/80-आई टी एं II]

S.O. 1297.—It is thereby notified for general information that the institution mentioned below has been approved by the Indian Council of Social Science Research, the prescribed authority for the purposes of clause (iii) of sub-section (1) of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961, subject to the following conditions :—

- The funds collected by the Model Institute of Education and Research, under this exemption will be utilized, exclusively for promotion of research in Social Sciences.
- That the M.I.E.R. shall maintain separate accounts of the funds collected by them under the exemption ; and
- That the M.I.E.R. shall send annual statement of accounts and annual report to the I.C.S.S.R. as well as to the concerned Commissioner of Income-tax, showing the funds collected by them under the exemption and the manner in which the funds were utilized.

INSTITUTION

The Model Institute of Education and Research, Jammu.

This notification is effective for a period of three years from 1-4-1980 to 31-3-1983.

[No. 3206/F. No. 203/99/80-ITA. II]

का०धा० 1298.—इस विभाग की अधिसूचना सं० 2068 [का०सं० 203/171/77-आई टी एं II] तारीख 12-12-1977 के क्रम में, सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि विहित प्राधिकारी, अर्थात् भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान अनुसंधान परिषद, नई दिल्ली ने निम्नलिखित संस्था को आयकर नियम, 1962 के नियम 6(ii) के साथ पठित, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ii) के प्रयोजनों के लिए चिकित्सा अनुसंधान के क्षेत्र में "वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संगम" प्रवर्ग के अधीन निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर अनुमोदित किया, है, अर्थात् :

- यह कि संस्थान चिकित्सा अनुसंधान के क्षेत्र में वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान के लिए प्राप्त राशियों का हिसाब पृथक रूप से रखेगी।
- उक्त संस्थान प्रत्येक वर्ष के लिए अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान संबंधी क्रिया कलापों की एक वार्षिक विवरणी परिषद को प्रति वर्ष 31 मई तक ऐसे प्रारूपों में प्रस्तुत करेगा जो इस प्रयोजन के लिए अधिकाधिक किया जाए और उसे सूचित किया जाए।
- उक्त संस्थान प्रत्येक वर्ष के लिए परिषद को लेखाओं का संपरीक्षित विवरण प्रतिवर्ष 31 मई तक प्रस्तुत करेगा और इसके अतिरिक्त एक प्रति सम्बद्ध आयकर प्रायुक्त को भेजेगा।

संस्था

सत्येती अस्पताल और चिकित्सा अनुसंधान केन्द्र, पुणे

यह अधिसूचना 1-2-1979 से 30-11-1982 तक तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए प्रवृत्त होगी।

[सं० 3207/का०सं० 203/95/80-आई टी एं II]

S.O. 1298.—In continuation of this Department's Notification No. 2068 (F. No. 203/171/77-ITA. II) dated 12-12-1977, it is hereby notified for general information that the institution mentioned below has been approved by Indian Council of Medical Research, New Delhi, the prescribed authority for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 read with Rule 6(ii) of the Income-tax Rules, 1962 under the category of "scientific research association" in the field of Medical Research subject to the following conditions :—

- That the Institute will maintain a separate account of the sums received by it for scientific research in the field of medical research.
- That the Institute will furnish annual returns of its scientific research activities to the Council for each year by 31st May each year at the latest in such form as may be laid down and intimated to them for this purpose.
- That the Institute will furnish an annual audited statement of accounts to the Council for each year by 31st May, each year and in addition send a copy of it to the concerned Income-tax Commissioner.

INSTITUTION

SANCHETI HOSPITAL & MEDICAL RESEARCH CENTRE, PUNE.

The notification is effective for a period of three years from 1-12-1979 to 30-11-1982.

[No. 3207/F. No. 203/95/80-ITA. II]

आय-कर

शुद्धिपत्र

नई दिल्ली, 20 मार्च, 1980

का० आ० 1299.—राजस्व विभाग, अधिसूचना सं० 2954 (फा० सं० 203/39/79-III ए. II), तारीख 2 अगस्त, 1979 में निम्नानुसार संशोधन करता है :—

आय-कर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35(I) (ii) के अधीन के स्थान पर आय-कर अधिनियम, 1922 की धारा 10(2) (xiii) के अधीन पढ़ें।

[सं० 3220/फा० सं० 203/39/79-आई० टी० ए० II]]
जे० पी० शर्मा, निदेशक

INCOME-TAX
CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 20th March, 1980

S.O. 1299.—The Department of Revenue hereby amend the notification No. 2954 (F. No. 203/39/79-III A II) dated the 2nd August, 1979, as under :—

For

Read

Under Section 35(I) (ii) of the Income-tax Act, 1961. Under Section 10(2) (xiii) of the Income-tax Act, 1922.

[No. 3220/F. No. 203/39/79-ITA. II]

J. P. Sharma, Director

(केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड)

नई दिल्ली, 5 फरवरी, 1980

का० आ० 1300.—सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए अधिसूचित कि या जाता है कि केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड ने निम्नलिखित संस्था को आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (2) के खण्ड (क) के प्रयोजनों के लिए केवल प्रबंध परामर्श के क्षेत्र में अनुमोदित किया है ?

संस्था

शाह-रिसर्च एसोसिएट्स प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, मुम्बई।

यह अनुमोदन 18 मई, 1979 से लागू है।

[सं० 3175/फा० सं० 203/106/79-आई० टी० ए० II]

जे० पी० शर्मा, निदेशक

(Central Board of Direct Taxes)

New Delhi, the 5th February, 1980

S.O. 1300.—It is hereby notified for general information that the institution mentioned below has been approved by the Central Board of Direct Taxes for the purposes of clause (a) of sub-section (2) of Section 35D of the Income-tax Act, 1961, in the field of Management Consultancy only.

INSTITUTION

SHAH RESEARCH ASSOCIATES PRIVATE LTD., BOMBAY.

The approval takes effect from 18th May, 1979.

[No. 3175/F. No. 203/106/79-ITA. II]

J.P. SHARMA, Director

(बैंकिंग कार्य विभाग)

(बैंकिंग प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 1980

का० आ० 1301.—बैंककारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 56 के साथ पठित धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की निष्कारिण पर एतद्वारा घोषणा करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 9 के उपखण्ड, इन अधिसूचना के भारत के राजपत्र में प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से 31 दिसम्बर 1980 तक की अवधि के लिए तीरुकोइलूर को-ऑपरेटिव यूनियन बैंक लि० तीरुकोइलूर पर उम सीमा तक लागू नहीं होंगे जहाँ तक इनका संबंध इस बैंक द्वारा कुछ गैरबैंकिंग परिसम्पत्तियों जिनका गौरा नोवे दिया गया है कि धारिता से है।

गैर-बैंकिंग परिसम्पत्तियां

क्रम सं०	व्योरा
1.	एक मकान — दरवाजा नं० 2, कट्टम्पूळली, स्ट्रीट तीरुकोइलूर।
2.	तीरुकोइलूर रवेन्यू ग्राम स्थित गौमी जमीन का 0.45 सेंट आर० एस० नं० 373/3

[संख्या 8(15)/80-ए०सी०]

यशवंत राज, अव्वर सचिव

(Department of Economic Affairs)

(Banking Division)

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 1980

S.O. 1301.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 53 read with Section 56 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949), the Central Government, on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that the provisions of Section 9 of the said Act shall not apply to the Tirukoilur Cooperative Urban Bank Ltd., Tirukoilur so far as they relate to its holding of certain non-banking assets as described below for the period from the date of publication of this notification in the Gazette of India to 31 December 1980.

Non-Banking Assets

Sr. No.	Description
1.	One House-Door No. 2, Kattampoosali Street, Tirukoilur
2.	0.45 cents of Wet Lands at Tirukoilur Revenue Village R.S. No. 373/3

[No. 8 (15)/80-AC]

YASHWANT RAJ, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 24 अप्रैल, 1980

का० आ० 1302.—भारतीय स्टेट बैंक अधिनियम, 1955 (1955 का 23) की धारा 19 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ड) की शर्तों के अनुसार केन्द्रीय सरकार, वित्त मंत्रालय, आर्थिक कार्य विभाग (बैंकिंग प्रभाग) के अपर सचिव श्री एम० बी० एम० जुनेजा की ओर एम० आर० ओक के स्थान पर भारतीय स्टेट बैंक के केन्द्रीय मण्डल में निदेशक नामित करती है।

[सं० एक० 9/1/80-बी० ओ० 1(1)]

New Delhi, the 24th April, 1980

S.O. 1302.—In terms of clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 19 of the State Bank of India Act, 1955 (23 of 1955), the Central Government hereby nominates Shri S. V. S. Juneja, Additional Secretary, Ministry of Finance Deptt. of Economic Affairs (Banking Division) to be the Director of the Central Board of the State Bank of India vice Shri M. R. Shroff.

[No. F. 9/1/80-BO.1(1)]

क्र० आ० 1303.—राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंक (प्रबंध और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध) योजना, 1970 की धारा 3 की उपधारा (ज) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार, श्री एम० आर० श्रोफ के स्थान पर वित्त मंत्रालय, आर्थिक कार्य विभाग (बैंकिंग प्रभाग), नयी दिल्ली के अपर सचिव, श्री एस० वी० एस० जुनेजा को एन०द्वारा संयुक्त बैंक आर्गनाइजेशन के निदेशक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[सं० एफ० 9/1/80-बी० आ० 1(2)]

ज० वा० मीरचन्दानी, उप सचिव

S.O. 1303.—In pursuance of sub-clause (b) of clause 3 of the Nationalised Banks (Management and Miscellaneous Provisions) Scheme, 1970, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri S. V. S. Juneja, Additional Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs (Banking Division), New Delhi as a Director of the Central Bank of India vice Shri M. R. Shroff.

[No. F. 9/1/80-BO.1(2)]

C. W. MIRCHANDANI, Dy. Secy.

वाणिज्य एवं नागरिक आपूर्ति मंत्रालय

(वाणिज्य विभाग)

संयुक्त मुख्य नियंत्रक आयात निर्यात का कार्यालय

(केन्द्रीय लाइसेंसिंग क्षेत्र)

नई दिल्ली, 26 फरवरी, 1980

निरस्तीकरण आदेश

क्र० आ० 1304.—सेसम कापरी इन्टरनेशनल प्रा० लि०, 303-305 कुशल बिल्डिंग 32/33 नेहरू प्लेस, नई दिल्ली-110019 को एक आयात लाइसेंस सं० पी०/डब्ल्यू/2862474 दिनांक 28-11-78 रु० 2,92,737 का कालम 4 अपैन्डिक्स 17 को सबों और प्रोडक्ट ग्रुप ई-1 डी-22, एच-1, एच-4 और एच-8 अप्रैल-मार्च 1979 अवधि के लिये दिया गया था।

उन्होंने एक शपथ-पत्र कार्य विधि पुस्तिका के पैरा 334, 1979-80 के अनुसार दिया है कि उनका लाइसेंस (कस्टम कार्पा) संस्था पी०/डब्ल्यू/2862474 दिनांक 28-11-78 को 292737 रु० ए० एम०-79 बिना कस्टम अधिकारी के कार्यालय में पंजीकृत किये बिना तथा उपयोग किये हो गुम हो गया है।

मैं सन्तुष्ट हूँ कि उपरोक्त लाइसेंस को कस्टम परपत्र कार्पा खो गयी है।

आयात व्यापार आदेश, 1955 विनांक 7-12-55 यथा संशोधित की धारा 9 सी० सी० में प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए मैं उपरोक्त लाइसेंस की संस्था पी०/डब्ल्यू/2862474 दिनांक 28-11-78 रु० 292737 को निरस्त किया जाता है।

आवेदक की प्रार्थना पर अब कार्यविधि पुस्तिका 79-80 के 334 के अनुसार उपरोक्त लाइसेंस की कस्टम कार्पा (अनुमति) पी०/डब्ल्यू/2862474 दिनांक 28-11-78 रु० 292737 को जारी करने पर विचार किया जा रहा है।

[क्र० सं० एम० पी० एम०/कापरी-16/जे० एम० 78/ई० पी० VI/सी० एल० ए०-2854]

बालाकृष्ण पिल्लै, उपमुख्य नियंत्रक आयात-निर्यात
कृते संयुक्त मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात-निर्यात**MINISTRY OF COMMERCE AND CIVIL SUPPLIES**

(Office of the Joint Chief Controller of Imports & Exports)

(Central Licensing Area)

New Delhi, the 26th February, 1980

CANCELLATION ORDER

S.O. 1304.—M/s. Kapri International (P) Ltd., 303-305, Kusal Building 32/33 Nehru Place, New Delhi-110019 was granted Import Licence No. P/W/2862474 dated 28-11-78 for Rs. 2,92,737 for import of Col. 4 items of Appendix 17 in respect of Product Groups E. 1, D. 2.2, H. 1, H. 4 & H. 8 of AM 79 period Policy.

They have filed an Affidavit as required under para 334 of Hand Book of Import Export Procedure 1979-80 wherein they have stated that Custom Copy of Licence No. P/W/2862474 dated 28-11-78 for Rs. 2,92,737 for AM 79 period and Export Period JS 78 has been misplaced without having been registered with any Customs and utilised at all.

I am satisfied that the Customs Purpose Copy of the said licence has been misplaced.

In exercise of the powers conferred on me under Section 9(cc) in the Import Trade Control Order, 1955 dated 7-12-55 as amended upto date, the said Customs Purpose Copy of the licence No. P/W/2862474 dated 28-11-78 for Rs. 2,92,737 is hereby Cancelled.

The applicant is now being issued duplicate Custom Purpose Copy of Import Licence No. P/W/2862474 dated 28-11-78 for Rs. 2,92,737 in accordance with the provisions of Para 334 of Hand Book of Import & Export Procedure 1979-80.

[File No. SPS/Kapri-16/JS-78/EP VI/CLA/2834]

S. BALAKRISHNA PILLAI, Dy. Chief Controller of

Imports & Exports.

For Jt. Chief Controller of Imports & Exports.

(वाणिज्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 23 अप्रैल, 1980

क्र० आ० 1305.—भारतीय व्यापार मेला प्राधिकरण को संस्था अंत-नियमावली के नियम 59(2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए राष्ट्रपति, श्री मोहम्मद युनुस को 23 अप्रैल, 1980 से प्राधिकरण के निदेशक तथा निदेशक बोर्ड के अध्यक्ष के रूप में नियुक्त करते हैं।

[सं० 2/80/1/1/77-टी० एफ०]

गिरीश धुमे, निदेशक

(Department of Commerce)

New Delhi, the 23rd April, 1980

S.O. 1305.—In exercise of the powers conferred under Articles 59(2) of the Articles of Association of the Trade Fair Authority of India, the President is pleased to appoint Shri Mohammad Yunus as Director and Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Authority with effect from 23rd April 1980.

[No. 2/80(1/1/77-TE)]

GIRISH DHUME, Director

संयुक्त मुख्य नियंत्रक आयात-निर्यात का कार्यालय

(केन्द्रीय लाइसेंस क्षेत्र)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 23 नवम्बर, 1979

क्र० आ० 1306.—मैसर्स फ्रेंड्स पेन स्टोर, 229 ओखला इन्डस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, नई दिल्ली को एक आयात लाइसेंस सं० पी/सी/1921427 दिनांक 13-7-79 रु० 53542 का बटिकल इजिन टर्निंग मशीन वास्ते फाउन्टेनपेन और बाल्बपॉइन्टपेन के मेटल कैप्स और बैरल लाइनिंग (री-बिल्टफन्डीशन) के लिये दिया गया था।

उन्होंने एक शपथ-पत्र कार्यविधि पुस्तिका के पैरा 334-1979-80 के अनुसार दिया है कि उनका लाइसेंस सं० पी/सी/1921427 दिनांक 13-7-79 का रु० 53542/- अप्रैल-मार्च-79 अवधि का बिना किसी कस्टम कार्यालय में पंजीकृत/उपयोग किये खो गया है।

मैं सन्तुष्ट हूँ कि उपरोक्त लाइसेंस की कस्टम तथा एक्सचेंज परपत्र काफी खो गयी है।

आयात व्यापार आदेश, 1955 दि० 7-12-55 यथा संशोधित की धारा 9 सी० सी० में प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए उपरोक्त लाइसेंस सं० पी/सी/1921427 दिनांक 13-7-79 रु० 53542/- को निरस्त करता हूँ।

कार्यविधि पुस्तिका 1979-80 के पैरा 334 के अनुसार आवेदक को लाइसेंस सं० पी/सी/1921427 दिनांक 13-7-79 रुपये 53542 की कस्टम तथा एक्सचेंज परपत्र काफी की, अनुसूचि जारी की जा रही है।

[क्र० सं० एल०-55/एसएसआई/सीजी/एम-79/ए.यू.-2/सी एल ए/1980]

आर० जयाराम नायडू,

उपमुख्य नियंत्रक आयात-निर्यात

हुते संयुक्त मुख्य नियंत्रक आयात-निर्यात

(Office of the Joint Chief Controller of Imports & Exports)

(Central Licensing Area)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 23rd November, 1979

S.O. 1306.—M/s. Friends Pen Store, 229, Okhla Industrial Estate, New Delhi were granted import licence No. P/C/1921427 dated 13-7-1979 for Rs. 53,542 for import of Vertical Engine Turning Machine for lining on metal caps and barrels of fountain pens, Ball point pens etc. (Re-built condition) and 2. Horizontal engine turning machine for lining on metal caps and barrels (Re-built condition).

They have filed an affidavit as required under Para 334 of Hand Book of Exports & Imports Procedure, 1979-80 wherein they have stated that licence No. P/C/1921427 dated 13-7-79 for Rs. 53,542/- for AM-79 period has been misplaced without having been registered with any Customs and utilised at all.

I am satisfied that the Customs Purpose copy and Exchange Control copy of the said licence has been misplaced.

In exercise of the powers conferred on me under Section 9(cc) in the Import Trade Control Order, 1955 dated 7-12-55 as amended upto date the said Import licence No. P/C/1921427 dt. 13-7-79 for Rs. 53,542 is hereby cancelled.

85 GI/80-4

The applicant is now being issued duplicate Custom Purpose copy and Exchange Control copy of import licence No. P/C/1921427 dated 13-7-79 for Rs. 53,542 in accordance with the provision of Para 334 of Hand Book of Imports and Exports, 1979-80.

[File No. L-55/SSI/CG/AM-79/AU-II/CLA/1980]

R. JAYARAM NAIDU,

Dy. Chief Controller of Imports & Exports
For Jt. Chief Controller of Imports & Exports

विदेश मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 25 अप्रैल, 1980

क्र० आ० 1307:—उत्प्रवासन अधिनियम, 1922 (1922 का सातवाँ) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्र सरकार, इसके द्वारा जन सम्पर्क अधिकारी श्री पी० के० सुकुमारन को 11-4-80 से सहायक पासपोर्ट अधिकारी, श्री एम० दिवाकरन के छुट्टी पर जाने के स्थान पर, अपने कार्यों के अतिरिक्त, क्षेत्रीय पासपोर्ट एवं उत्प्रवासन कार्यालय, कोचीन में उत्प्रवासन संरक्षक के रूप में भी नियुक्त करती है।

[सं० सी पी ह ओ/3/80]

एस० के० वर्मा, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

New Delhi, the 25th April, 1980

S.O. 1307.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 3 of the Emigration Act, 1922 (VII of 1922), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri P. K. Sukumaran, Public Relations Officer, as Protector of Emigrants in the Regional Passport and Emigration Office, Cochin in addition to his own duties w.e.f. 11-4-1980 vice Shri M. Divakaran, Assistant Passport Officer who has proceeded on leave.

[No. CPEO/3/80]

S. K. VERMA, Under Secy.

पेट्रोलियम, रसायन और उर्वरक मंत्रालय

(पेट्रोलियम विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 14 अप्रैल, 1980

क्र० आ० 1308.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में से सलाया पोर्ट से उत्तर प्रदेश में मथुरा तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पार्श्व लाइन इंडियन आयल कारपोरेशन द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिये।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्पावद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्द्वारा घोषित किया है।

वर्तते कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पार्श्व लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, इंडियन आयल

कार्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, सलाया-मथुरा पाईप लाईन प्रोजेक्ट, बी-18, शिवमार्ग, बनीपार्क जयपुर-6 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट : यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत : हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

तहसील : अजमेर	जिला : अजमेर		राज्य : राजस्थान		
ग्राम	खसरा नं०		क्षेत्रफल		
	साविक	हाल	हे०	ऐ०	वर्गमीटर
अस्तारी	718	831	0	01	62
	719	832	0	05	67
	720	833	0	03	24
	721	834	0	07	28
रामसर	6057	7886	0	01	62

[सं० 12020/5/80-प्रो० 1]

MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM CHEMICALS AND
FERTILIZER

(Department of Petroleum)

New Delhi, the 14th April, 1980

S.O. 1308.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Salaya Port in Gujarat to Mathura in Uttar Pradesh Pipelines should be laid by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited.

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the Right of User in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declare its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Salaya-Koyali-Mathura Pipeline Project, B-18, Shiv Marg, Bani Park, Jaipur-6.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

Tehsil : Ajmer	District : Ajmer		State : Rajasthan		
Village	Khasra No		Area		
	Old	New	H.	A.	Sq. M.
Ansari	718	831	0	01	62
	719	832	0	05	67
	720	833	0	03	24
	721	834	0	07	28
Ramsar	6057	7886	0	01	62

[No. 12020/5/80-Prod. 1]

का० जा० 1309.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में सलाया पोर्ट में उत्तर प्रदेश में मथुरा तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पाईप लाइन इंडियन आयल कार्पोरेशन द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिये।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एन्ड्रायड अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का भयना आणय एन्ड्रायड घोषित किया है।

वशतः कि उक्त भूमि में हिनबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाईप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, इंडियन आयल कार्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, सलाया-मथुरा पाईप लाइन प्रोजेक्ट, बी-18, शिवमार्ग, बनीपार्क जयपुर-6 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट : यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत : हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

तहसील :	व्यावर	जिला : अजमेर	राज्य : राजस्थान		
ग्राम	खसरा नं०		क्षेत्रफल		
	साविक	हाल	हे०	ऐ०	वर्ग-मीटर
बाड़िया थ्यासा व बाड़िया जगा	240	362	0	01	62
	240	363	0	00	81
	241	366	0	00	81
लमाड़िया	68	75	0	05	67
	67/1222	73	0	01	62
कानाखेडा	1311	2110	0	03	24
	1325	2129	0	03	24
खरवा	4056	6266	0	02	43
	4057	6266	0	09	71

[सं० 12020/5/80-प्रो० 2-1]

S.O. 1309.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of Petroleum from Salaya Port in Gujarat to Mathura in Uttar Pradesh Pipelines should be laid by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited.

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the Right of User in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declare its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Salaya-Koyali-Mathura Pipeline Project, B-18, Shiv Marg, Bani Park, Jaipur-6.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

Tehsil : Beawar	District : Ajmer		State : Rajasthan		
Village	Khasra No.		Area		
	Old	New	H.	A.	Sq. M.
Badiya Shyama & Badiya Jagga	240	362	0	01	62
	240	363	0	00	81
	241	366	0	00	81
Lasadiya	68	75	0	05	67
	67/1222	73	0	01	62
Kana Khera	1311	2110	0	03	24
	1325	2129	0	03	24
Kharwa	4056	6266	0	02	43
	4057	6266	0	09	71

[No. 12020/5/80-Prod. II]

का० भा० 1310.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में कूप नं० डबका-14 से जी० सी० एम० तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पार्श्व लाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों का बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एनर्वाइज्ड अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पारंप लाईन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एनर्वाइज्ड घोषित किया है।

बतौर कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पारंप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस तथा आयोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड, बड़ोदरा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिश्चितः यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिशः हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

कूप नं० जी० सी० एम० (डबका-14) से गवासद जी० सी० एम० तक पारंप लाइन बिछाने के लिए।

राज्य : गुजरात	जिला : भाखुच	तालुका : अंबुसर
1	2	3
कानवा	789	0 02 34
	781	0 09 10
	782	0 11 05
	752	0 12 00
	749	0 09 75
	744	0 16 25
	745	0 16 25
	741	0 23 40
	695	0 13 00

1	2	3
	700	0 08 45
	701	0 09 75
	696	0 07 80
	691	0 07 80
	690	0 03 77
	677	0 04 16
	670	0 16 90

[सं० 12016/21/80-प्र०]

S.O. 1310.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Dabka-14 to GCS in Gujarat State pipelines should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Vadodara-390009.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

R.O.U. for laying pipeline from Well No. DBN (BABKA-14) to Gavasad GCS

State : Gujarat	District : Broach	Taluka : Jambusar		
Village	Block No.	Hec- tare	Are	Centiare
Kanva	789	0	02	34
	781	0	09	10
	782	0	11	05
	752	0	12	00
	749	0	09	75
	744	0	16	25
	745	0	16	25
	741	0	23	40
	695	0	13	45
	700	0	08	00
	701	0	09	75
	696	0	07	80
	691	0	07	80
	690	0	03	77
	677	0	04	16
670	0	16	90	

[No. 12016/21/80-Prod.]

नई दिल्ली, 16 अप्रैल, 1980

का० भा० 1311.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में कूप नं० डबका-14 से जी० सी० एम० तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पार्श्व लाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों का बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एनर्वाइज्ड अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे राईन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम अधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस तथा आयोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड, बड़ोदरा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट: यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

डबका-14 से जी० सी० एस० तक पाईप लाइन बिछाने के लिए

राज्य : गुजरात	जिला : बरोदा	तालुका : पादरा		
गाँव	सर्वे नं०	हेक्टेयर	ए० पाई० सेन्टी- ई०	य०
गामेठा	497/2	0	07	15
	500	0	03	90
	503	0	19	89
	502	0	00	65
	517	0	15	36
	516	0	06	50
	513	0	06	76
	514/1	0	03	90
	514/2	0	04	29
	557	0	11	05
	556	0	03	90
	553	0	08	45
	42/1	0	05	20
	43/1	0	13	39
	44/1	0	06	50
	70	0	05	20
	69/2	0	06	50
	86/1	0	03	90
	86/2	0	01	30
	87	0	05	85
	88	0	01	30
	89	0	00	65
	93	0	14	56

[सं० 12016/14/80-प्रो०-I]

New Delhi, the 16th April, 1980

S.O. 1311.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Dabka-14 to GCS in Gujarat State pipelines should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Vadodara-390 009.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

Pipeline from DABKA-14 to GCS

State : Gujarat	District : Baroda	Taluka : Padra		
Village	Survey No.	Hec- tare	Ac- re	Centi- tiare
Gametha	497/2	0	07	15
	500	0	03	90
	503	0	19	89
	502	0	00	65
	517	0	15	36
	516	0	06	50
	513	0	06	76
	514/1	0	03	90
	514/2	0	04	29
	557	0	11	05
	556	0	03	90
	553	0	08	45
	42/1	0	05	20
	43/1	0	13	39
	44/1	0	06	50
	70	0	05	20
	69/2	0	06	50
	86/1	0	03	90
	86/2	0	01	30
	87	0	05	85
	88	0	01	30
	89	0	00	65
	93	0	14	56

[No. 12016/14/80-Prod. II]

का० प्रा० 1312.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में कूप नं० ब्लासोरा-13 से ब्लासोरा-9 तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाईप लाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी स्थानों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एतद्वारा अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

वर्तते कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम अधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस तथा आयोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड, बड़ोदरा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करनेवाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट: यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

झालोरा-13 से झालोरा-9 तक पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए ।

राज्य : गुजरात	जिला : मेहसाना	तालुका : कड़ी		
गांव	सर्वे नं०	हेक्टेयर	ए० आर० ई०	सेन्टी- यर
करसन पुरा	18	0	03	75
कार्ट ट्रैक		0	01	00
	19	0	15	60
	20	0	06	00
	81/1	0	21	23
	81/ए	0	04	50
	81/बी	0	20	25
	62	0	12	75
	63	0	04	50
	64	0	03	00

[सं० 12016/13/80-प्रो० 2]

S.O. 1312.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Jhalora-13 to Jhalora-9 in Gujarat State pipelines should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Vadodara-390 009.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

Pipeline from Jhalora-13 to Jhalora-9

State : Gujarat	District : Mehsana	Taluka : KADI		
Village	Survey No.	Hec- tare	Are	Centiare
Karsanpura	18	0	03	75
	Cart track	0	01	00
	19	0	15	60
	20	0	06	00
	81/1	0	21	23
	81/A	0	04	50
	81/B	0	20	25
	62	0	12	75
	63	0	04	50
	64	0	03	00

[No. 12016/13/80-Prod. II]

का० खा० 1313.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोक-हित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में कूप नं० बी० आर० सी० से जी० जी० एम० विराज तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पाइप लाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए ।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एतद्पाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है ।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उनमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है ।

वशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए, आक्षेप मक्षम अधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड, वडोदरा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा ।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करनेवाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट: यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी सिविल व्यवसायी की माफ़त ।

अनुसूची

बी० आर० सी० से जी० जी० एम० विराज तक पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए ।

राज्य : गुजरात	जिला : मेहसाना	तहसील : कड़ी		
गांव	सर्वे नं०	हेक्टेयर	ए० आर० ई०	सेन्टी- यर
नानी कड़ी	114/ए	0	07	50
	117/ए	0	10	80
	128/ए	0	16	80
	133	0	13	20
	134	0	06	75
	142/3	0	08	25
	142/1	0	08	25
	141	0	10	50
	138/1	0	25	65
	154	0	07	80
	136	0	03	50

[सं० 12016/13/80-प्रो० 1]

S.O. 1313.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from VRC to GGS VIRAJ in Gujarat State pipelines should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Vadodara-390 009.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

Pipeline from VRC to GGS Viraj				
State : Gujarat	District : Mehsana	Taluka : Kadi		
Village	Survey No.	Hec-tare	Are	Centiare
Nani Kadi	114/A	0	07	50
	117/A	0	10	80
	128/A	0	16	80
	133	0	13	20
	134	0	06	75
	142/3	0	08	25
	142/1	0	08	25
	141	0	10	50
	138/1	0	25	65
	154	0	07	80
	136	0	03	50

[No. 12016/13/80-Prod. I]

का० आ० 1314.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोक-हित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में कूप नं० डबका-14 से जी० सी० एस० तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पाइप लाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस प्रायोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए;

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एक्वाइड अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है;

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है;

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम अधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस तथा प्रायोग, निर्माण और वेखभाल प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड, बड़ोदरा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा;

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिश्चितः यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

डबका-14 से जी० सी० एस० तक पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए

राज्य : गुजरात जिला : बड़ोदरा तालुका : पादरा

गांव सर्वे नं० हेक्टेयर ए० धार० सन्दी-

1	2	3	4	5
				ई० यर
	153	0	07	80
गवासद	154	0	07	15
	155	0	09	75
	158	0	09	10
	159	0	11	70
	162	0	02	60
	161	0	03	90
	163	0	09	49
	165	0	07	80
	166/1	0	07	80
	140	0	03	64
	124	0	10	40
	123	0	01	04

1	2	3	4	5
गवासद—जारी	122	0	06	50
	126	0	08	45
	113/2	0	02	60
	113/1	0	07	80

[सं० 12016/14/80-प्रो०-II]

S.O. 1314.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Dabka-14 to GCS in Gujarat State pipelines should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Vadodara-390 009,

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

Pipeline from Dabka-14 to GCS

State : Gujarat	District : Baroda	Taluka : Padra		
Village	Survey No.	Hec-tare	Are	Centiare
Gawasad	153	0	07	80
	154	0	07	15
	155	0	09	75
	158	0	09	10
	159	0	11	70
	162	0	02	60
	161	0	03	90
	163	0	09	49
	165	0	07	80
	166/1	0	07	80
	140	0	03	64
	124	0	10	40
	123	0	01	04
	122	0	06	50
	126	0	08	45
	113/2	0	02	60
	113/1	0	07	80

[No. 12016/14/80-Prod. II]

का० आ० 1333.—यतः पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि के उपयोग के अधिकार अर्जन) अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और रसायन संसलय (पेट्रोलियम विभाग) की अधिसूचना का० आ० सं० 3638 तारीख 6-12-78 द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिश्चित भूमियों के उपयोग के अधिकार को पाइप लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए अर्जित करने का अपना आशय घोषित कर दिया था;

और यतः सक्षम प्राधिकारी के उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन सरकार को रिपोर्ट देनी है;

और आगे, यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है,

अब, अतः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (i) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्ति का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि इस अधिसूचना में संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार पाश्चात्य बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अर्जित किया जाता है;

और आगे उस धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने के बजाय तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग में, सभी बाधाओं से मुक्त रूप में, घोषणा के प्रकाशन की इस तारीख को निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

एस० डी० जी० में एस० डी० एफ० तक पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए

राज्य : गुजरात	जिला : मेहसाना	तालुका : मेहसाना		
गांव	सर्वे नं०	हेक्टेयर	एअरई	सेन्टीयर
1	2	3	4	5
हेबुरा	50	0	07	50
	कार्ट-ट्रैक	0	01	00
	72	0	05	40
	71	0	03	75
	73	0	07	00
	74	0	08	75
	91	0	06	50
	कार्ट-ट्रैक	0	00	60
	86	0	06	67
	88	0	01	20
	290	0	07	75
	98	0	01	00

[सं० 12016/15/78-प्र०]

S.O. 1315.—Whereas by a notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum, S.O. No. 3638, dated 6-12-78 under Sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land), Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline;

And whereas the Competent Authority has under Sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Government;

And further whereas the Central Government has, after considering the said report, decided to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification hereby acquired for laying the pipelines;

And further in exercise of power conferred by Sub-section (4) of that Section, the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in the Central Government vest on this date of the publication of this declaration in the Oil and Natural Gas Commission free from encumbrances.

SCHEDULE Rou from SDG to SDF

State : Gujarat	Distt. : Mehsana	Taluka : Mehsana		
Village	Survey No	Hect-arc	Are	Centiare
Hebura	50	0	07	50
	Cart Track	0	01	00
	72	0	05	40
	71	0	03	75
	73	0	07	00
	74	0	06	75
	91	0	06	50
	Cart-track	0	00	60
	86	0	06	67
	88	0	01	20
	290	0	07	75
	98	0	01	00

[No. 12016/15/78-Prod.]

नई दिल्ली, 19 अप्रैल, 1980

का० भा० 1316.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में कूप नं० एस० टी० डी० में एस० एन० के०-1 तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पाइप लाईन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए;

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाईनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है;

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है;

बतर्ने कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम अधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस तथा आयोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड, बड़ोदरा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा;

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट: यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधिक व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

कूप नं० एस० टी० डी० में एस० एन० के०-1 तक पाइप लाइन

बिछाने के लिए

राज्य : गुजरात	जिला : भाख	तालुका : हांसोद		
गांव	ब्लॉक नं०	हेक्टेयर	एअरई	सेन्टीयर
1	2	3	4	5
गंहीद	501	00	05	85

[सं० 12016/3/80-प्र०]

New Delhi, the 19th April, 1980

S.O. 1316.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from MTD to SNK-1 in Gujarat State pipelines should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makrapura Road, Vadodra-390 009.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

R.O.U. from well No. MTD to SNK-1

State : Gujarat	District : Broach	Taluka : Hansot
Village	Block No.	Hec- Are Centiare
Rohid	501	00 05 85

[No. 12016/3/80-Prod.]

नई दिल्ली, 21 अप्रैल, 1980

का० आ० 1317.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में कूप नं० कानावाडा-2 से चांगडा-1 तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पाईप लाईन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस प्रायोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाईनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एतद्पावद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्द्वारा घोषित किया है।

यद्यपि कि उक्त भूमि में हितवद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम अधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस तथा प्रायोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड, बड़ोदरा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट: यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

कानवाडा-2 से चांगडा-1 तक पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए

राज्य : गुजरात	जिला : खेडा	तहसील : खम्भात
गांव	सर्वे नं०	हेक्टेयर एअरई सेन्टीयर
1	2	3 4 5
कनवाडा	79	0 12 35
	98	0 04 07
	94	0 14 02
	95/2	0 11 70

[सं० 12016/5/80 प्रो I]

New Delhi, the 21st April, 1980

S.O. 1317.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Kanawada-2 to Changada-1 in Gujarat State pipelines should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein :

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent

Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Vadodra-390 009.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

R.O.U. for laying pipeline from Kanawada-2 to Changada-1

State : Gujarat	District : Kheda	Taluka : Cambay
Village	Survey No.	Hec- Are Centiare
Kanawada	79	0 12 35
	98	0 04 07
	94	0 14 02
	95/2	0 11 70

[No. 12016/5/80-Prod. II]

का० आ० 1318.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में कूप नं० कानावाडा-2 से चांगडा-1 तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पाईप लाईन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस प्रायोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाईनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एतद्पावद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्द्वारा घोषित किया है।

यद्यपि कि उक्त भूमि में हितवद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम अधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस तथा प्रायोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड, बड़ोदरा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट: यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

कानवाडा-2 से चांगडा-1 तक पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए

राज्य : गुजरात	जिला : खेडा	तालुका : खंबात
गांव	सर्वेक्षण नं०	हेक्टेयर एअरई सेन्टीयर
चांगडा	34/35/44	0 07 28
	43	0 09 10
	41	0 09 10
	40	0 06 50
	37	0 04 81
	38	0 14 43
	कार्ट-ड्रेक	0 00 65
	631/1 और 2	0 03 90
	632	0 42 90
	633	0 11 70
	612	0 11 44
	611	0 17 94
	कार्ट-ड्रेक	0 00 78
	652/1	0 07 41
	652/2	0 03 90

[सं० 12016/5/80-प्रो II]

S.O. 1318.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Kanawada-2 to Changada-1 in Gujarat State pipelines should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein :

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Vadodara-390 009.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

For laying pipeline from Kanawada-2 to Changada-1

State : Gujarat	District : Kheda	Taluka : Cambay			
Village	Survey No.	Hectare	Are	Centiare	
Changada	34/35/44	0	07	28	
	43	0	09	10	
	41	0	09	10	
	40	0	06	50	
	37	0	04	81	
	38	0	14	43	
	Cart-track	0	00	65	
	631/1 & 2	0	03	90	
	632	0	42	90	
	633	0	11	70	
	612	0	11	44	
	611	0	17	94	
	Cart-track	0	00	78	
	652/1	0	07	41	
	652/2	0	03	90	

[No. 12016/5/80-Prod. II]

कांभा. 1319.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में कूप नं० सी०बी०बी० से 24 तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाइप लाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एवढपावड़ अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हिततुष्ट कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम अधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस तथा आयोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड, बबोदरा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्विष्ट यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसको सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की माफत।

अनुसूची

सी०बी०बी० (55) से कूप नं० 24 तक पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए।

राज्य : गुजरात	जिला : खेडा	तालुका : खम्भात			
गांव	सर्वे नं०	हेक्टेयर	एम्पारआई	सेण्टीयर	
नागरा	1447	0	14	04	
	1450	0	05	33	
	1451	0	08	19	
	1453	0	10	98	
	1454	0	06	69	
	1455	0	00	97	
	1437/1456	0	13	58	
	1457	0	05	72	
	1458	0	02	99	
	1460	0	06	70	
	1461	0	16	51	
	1467	0	04	29	
	1468	0	05	46	
	1425	0	09	88	
	1391	0	00	78	
	1397	0	11	98	
	1399	0	04	94	
	1400	0	08	84	
	1404	0	05	49	
	1405	0	06	82	
	1407	0	07	83	
	1377	0	11	98	
	1376	0	07	80	

[सं० 12016/22/80-प्रो०]

S.O. 1319.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from CBB to 24 in Gujarat State pipelines should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein :

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Vadodara-390 009.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

D.S. CBB(55) to D.S. 24

State : Gujarat	Distt. : Kaira	Taluka : Cambay			
Village	Survey No.	Hect.	Are	Centiare	
Nagra	1447	0	14	04	
	1450	0	05	33	
	1451	0	08	19	
	1453	0	10	98	
	1454	0	06	69	

1	2	3	4	5
	1455	0	00	97
	1437 & 1456	0	13	58
	1457	0	05	72
	1458	0	02	99
	1460	0	06	70
	1461	0	16	51
	1467	0	04	29
	1468	0	05	46
	1425	0	09	88
	1391	0	00	78
	1397	0	11	98
	1399	0	04	94
	1400	0	08	84
	1404	0	05	49
	1405	0	06	82
	1407	0	07	83
	1377	0	11	98
	1376	0	07	80

[No. 12016/22/80-Prod.]

का० भा० 1320.—सं० यतः पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि के उपयोग के अधिकार अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और रसायन मंत्रालय (पेट्रोलियम विभाग) की अधिसूचना का० भा० सं० 2522 तारीख 2-7-79 द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों के उपयोग के अधिकार को पाइप लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए अर्जित करने का अपना आशय प्रकट कर दिया था।

और यतः सक्षम प्राधिकारी के उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन सरकार की रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और आगे, यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अब, यतः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (i) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्ति का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि इस अधिसूचना में संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार पाइप लाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन लिए एतद्वारा अर्जित किया जाता है।

और आगे उस धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने के बजाय तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग में, सभी नावाचांगों से मुक्त रूप में, घोषणा के प्रकाशन की इस तारीख को निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

प्रतीक—वेब बिछाने के लिए

राज्य : गुजरात	जिला : मेहसाणा	तालुका : कडी
गांव	सर्वे नं०	हेक्टेयर
कडी	1975	0
		09 60

[सं० 12016/30/79 प्रो०]

S.O. 1320.—Whereas by a notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum, S.O. No. 2522 dated 2-7-79 under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the Schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline;

And whereas the Competent Authority has under sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Government;

And further whereas the Central Government has, after considering the said report, decided to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the Schedule appended to this notification ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said lands specified in the Schedule appended to this notification hereby acquired for laying the pipelines ;

And further in exercise of power conferred by sub-section (4) of that Section, the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in the Central Government vest on this date of the publication of this declaration in the Oil & Natural Gas Commission free from encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

ROU for Anode Bed

State : Gujarat District : Mehsana Taluka : Kadi

Village	Survey No.	Hec-tare	Are	Cent-tiare
Kadi	1975	0	09	60

[No. 12016/30/79-Prod.]

नई दिल्ली, 23 मई, 1980

का० भा० 1321.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में सलाया पोर्ट से उत्तर प्रदेश में मथुरा तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाइप लाइन इंडियन आयन कारपोरेशन द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उक्त भूमि के सीके पाईपलाइन बिछाने के लिए आशय सक्षम प्राधिकारी, इंडियन आयन कारपोरेशन निमिटेड, सलाया-मथुरा पाइप लाइन प्रोजेक्ट, बी-18, शिव मार्ग, मनीपार्क जयपुर 6 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आशय करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट: यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह चाहता है कि उसकी मुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी निधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

तहसील : घाबू रोड	जिला : सिरोही	राज्य : राजस्थान
ग्राम	खसरा नं०	क्षेत्रफल
		हेक्टेयर एयर वर्गमीटर
सातपुर	750	0 08 85

[सं० 12020/2/80-प्रो०]

New Delhi, the 23rd April, 1980

S.O. 132.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Salaya Port in Gujarat to Mathura in Uttar Pradesh pipelines should be laid by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited.

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declare its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Salaya-Koyali-Mathura Pipeline Project, B-18, Shiv Marg, Bani Park, Jaipur-6.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

Tehsil : Abu Road	District : Sirohi	State : Rajasthan
Village	Khasra No.	Area
		H. A. Sq. M.
Santpur	750	0 08 85

[No. 12020/2/80-Prod.]

का० खा० 1322.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में कूप नं० एम० टी० एक० से इन्क्यू० एम० बी० तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पाईप लाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी सार्वजनिक की बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्पाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

बगल कि उक्त भूमि में हितवद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सभ्य अधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस तथा आयोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड, वडोदरा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिश्चितः यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

कूप नं० एम० टी० एक० से कूप नं० इन्क्यू० एम० बी० तक पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए।

राज्य : गुजरात	जिला : ब्रोच	तालुका : हंसोट
गांव	ब्लॉक नं०	हेक्टेयर एघारई सेंटीयर
रोहिद	48	0 30 55
	49	0 07 80
	55	0 09 75
	51	0 09 75
	52	0 16 90
	78	0 28 60
	81	0 18 20
	82	0 02 60
	83	0 15 60
	84	0 02 60
	71	0 02 60

[सं० 12016/19/80-प्रोड० II]

S.O. 1322.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from MTF to WMB in Gujarat State pipelines should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Vadodra-390 009.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

R.O.U. for Laying Pipeline from well No. MTF to Well No. WMB

State : Gujarat	District : Broach	Taluka : Hansot
Village	Block No.	Hec-tare Arc Centiare
Rohid	48	0 30 55
	49	0 07 80
	55	0 09 75
	51	0 09 75
	52	0 16 90
	78	0 28 60
	81	0 18 20
	82	0 02 60
	83	0 15 60
	84	0 02 90
	71	0 02 60

[No. 12016/19/80-Prod.-II]

का० आ० 1323.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में कूप नं० एम० टी० एफ से डब्ल्यू० एम० बी० तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पाईप लाईन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाईनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एतद्पाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाईन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्द्वारा घोषित किया है।

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम अधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस तथा आयोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड, वडोदरा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिश्चितः यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

कूप नं० एम० टी० एफ० से कूप नं० डब्ल्यू० एम० बी० तक पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए।

राज्य : गुजरात	जिला : भाखुब	तालुका : हासोट
गांव	प्लॉट नं०	हेक्टेयर एम्राई सेन्टीयर
कलम	158	0 09 75
	163	0 19 50
	164	0 16 90
	178	0 14 30
	168	0 02 60
	173	0 15 60
	201	0 03 90

[सं० 12016/19/80-प्रोड० I]

S.O. 1323.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from MTF to WMB in Gujarat State pipelines should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road Vadodra-390 009.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

Pipeline from Well No. MTF to Well No. WMB
State : Gujarat District : Broach Taluka : Hansot

Village	Block No.	Hec-tare	Are	Cent-taiare
Kalam	158	0	09	75
	163	0	19	50
	164	0	16	90
	178	0	14	30
	168	0	02	60
	173	0	15	60
	201	0	03	90

[No. 12016/19/80-Prod. I]

का० आ० 1324.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में कूप नं० बी० आर० डी० से जी० जी० एम० विराज तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पाईप लाईन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाईनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एतद्पाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्द्वारा घोषित किया है।

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम अधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस तथा आयोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड, वडोदरा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिश्चितः यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

बी० आर० डी० से जी० जी० एम० विराज तक पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए।

राज्य : गुजरात	जिला : मेहसाना	तहसील : कड़ी
गांव	प्लॉट नं०	हेक्टेयर एम्राई सेन्टीयर
मानी कड़ी	189/1	0 14 25
	189	0 25 35
	190/8	0 11 25
	190/6	0 06 75
	190/7	0 09 00
	190/5	0 04 50
	190/4	0 08 55
	190/3	0 11 05
	190/2	0 02 40
	190/9	0 09 40
	190/10	0 08 00
	190/11	0 01 00

गांव	सर्वे नं०	हेक्टेयर ए.आर.ई.	सेन्टीयर
कार्ट ट्रैक		0	01
182		0	23
181		0	12
कार्ट ट्रैक		0	01
178/8		0	01

[सं० 12016/17/80-प्रो०]

S.O. 1324.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from VRD to GGS VIRAJ in Gujarat State pipelines should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Vadodara-390 009.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE**Pipeline from VRD to GGS Viraj**

State : Gujarat	District : Mehsana	Taluka : Kadi		
Village	Survey No.	Hec- tare	Are	Centiare
Nani Kadi	189/1	0	14	25
	189	0	25	35
	190/8	0	11	25
	190/6	0	06	75
	190/7	0	09	00
	190/5	0	04	50
	190/4	0	08	55
	190/3	0	11	05
	190/2	0	02	40
	190/9	0	09	40
	190/10	0	08	00
	190/11	0	01	00
	Cart track	0	01	00
	182	0	23	70
	181	0	12	00
Cart track	0	01	50	
178/8	0	01	00	

[No. 12016/17/80-Prod. I]

का० आ० 1325.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में कूप नं० बी०आर० बी० से जी०जी० विराज तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पार्श्व लाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयत्न के लिये एन०एन०एन० अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पार्श्व लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एन०एन०एन० घोषित किया है।

बगैर कि उक्त भूमि में हितग्रस्त कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पार्श्व लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम अधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस तथा आयोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड, वडोदरा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट: यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

बी०आर० बी० से जी०जी०एन० विराज तक पार्श्व लाइन बिछाने

राज्य : गुजरात	जिला : मेहसाना	तहसील : कडी	
गांव	सर्वे नं०	हेक्टेयर	एअरार्ड सेन्टीयर
नानी कडी	219	0	04 05
	176/1	0	25 65
	176/1ए	0	07 65
	178/2	0	19 95
	178/3	0	03 45
	179	0	11 25
	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	01 95

[सं० 12016/17/80-प्रो० 2]

S.O. 1325.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from VRD to GGS VIRAJ in Gujarat State pipelines should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Vadodara-390 009.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE**Pipeline from VRB to GGS Viraj**

State : Gujarat	District : Mehsana	Taluka : Kadi		
Village	Survey No.	Hec- tare	Are	Centiare
Nani Kadi	219	0	04	05
	176/1	0	25	65
	176/1A	0	07	65
	178/2	0	19	95
	178/3	0	03	45
	179	0	11	25
	Cart track	0	01	95

[No. 12016/17/80-Prod. II]

का० आ० 1326:—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में कूप नं० नार्थ कडी जीजीएस-1 से नार्थ कडी सी टी एफ तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पाईप लाईन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाईनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एनक्वायड अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज वाष्प लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आक्षेप एनक्वायड द्वारा घोषित किया है।

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे वाष्प लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम अधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड, वडोदरा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्टतः यह भी कबज करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी मुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी बिधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

नार्थकडी जीजीएस-1 से नार्थ कडी सीटीएफ तक

राज्य : गुजरात	जिला : अहमदाबाद	तालुका : बिरमगाम		
गांव	सर्वेक्षण नं०	हेक्टेयर	एअरई	सेन्टीयर
भटारीया	58/3	0	02	85
	58/2	0	04	50
	58/1	0	08	25
	72/3	0	09	30
बालमासण	215	0	02	25

[सं० 12016/2/80-प्रोड०]

S.O. 1326.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from North Kadi GGS-1 to North Kadi CTF in Gujarat State pipelines should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein :

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Vadodra-390 009.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

ROU From North Kadi GGS-I to North Khdia CTF

State : Gujarat District : Ahmedabad Taluka : Viramgam

Villages	Survey No.	Hec-tare	Are	Centiare
Bhataria	58/3	0	02	85
	58/2	0	04	50
	58/1	0	08	25
	72/3	0	09	30
Balsasan	215	0	02	25

[No. 12016/2/80-Prod.]

शुद्धि-पत्र

नई दिल्ली, 24 अप्रैल, 1980

का० आ० 1327:—भारत सरकार के राजपत्र के भाग-II खण्ड 3, उपखण्ड (ii) दिनांक 17-3-79 के पृष्ठ संख्या 795 पर का० आ० संख्या 972 के अन्तर्गत प्रकाशित, भारत सरकार पेट्रोलियम की अधिसूचना संख्या 120/6/14/79-उत्पादन दिनांक 2-3-79 के अधीन निम्न-लिखित अनुसूची के स्थान पर नीचे दी गई अनुसूची को पढ़ें।

पढ़ें

के लिये

गांव	तालुका	जिला	गांव	तालुका	जिला
मोटवान	अंकलेश्वर	भरुच	मोटवान	अंकलेश्वर	अंकलेश्वर

[संख्या 12016/14/79-प्रो०]

किरण चड्ढा, अवर सचिव

ERRATUM

New Delhi, the 24th April, 1980

S.O. 1327.—In the notification Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum No. 12016/14/79-Prod. dated 2-3-79, under S.O. No. 972 in the Gazette of Government of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii), dated 17-3-79, Page No. 795.

READ

FOR

Village	Taluka	District	Village	Taluka	District
Motwan	Ankleshwar	Bharuch	Motwan	Ankleshwar	Ankleshwar

[No. 12016/14/79-Prod.]

KIRAN CHADHA, Under Secy.

स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण मंत्रालय

(स्वास्थ्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 24 अप्रैल, 1980

का० आ० 1328:—भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद अधिनियम, 1956 (1956 का 102) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के उपबन्धों का अनुसरण करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एनक्वायड भारत सरकार, स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण मंत्रालय (स्वास्थ्य विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं० बी० 11013/21/79-एम.ई. (पी), दिनांक 5 जनवरी, 1980 में निम्न-लिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात्:—

उक्त अधिसूचना के पैरा 1 में "भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद का सदस्य निर्वाचित किया है" शब्दों के स्थान पर "31 मार्च, 1979 से भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद का सदस्य निर्वाचित किया है" शब्द जोड़ रखे जायेंगे।

[संख्या बी० 11013/2/79-एम.ई० (नोति)]

MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE

स्कीम का प्रारूप

(Department of Health)

New Delhi, the 24th April, 1980

S.O. 1328.—In pursuance of the provision of sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 (102 of 1956), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment to the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare (Department of Health) No. V. 11013/21/79-M.E. (P), dated 5th January, 1980, namely:—

In the said notification, in paragraph I, for the words "to be a member of the Indian Medical Council", the words, figures and letters "to be a member of the Indian Medical Council with effect from 31st March, 1979" shall be substituted.

[No. V. 11013/21/79-M.E. (Policy)]

का० खा० 1328.—भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद अधिनियम, 1956 (1956 का 102) की धारा 14 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद से परामर्श करने के बाद एतद्वारा निवेश देती है कि जिसका अर्थ है कि एम०डी० (फार ईस्टर्न यूनिवर्सिटी, मनीला, फिलिपाइन्स) उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए मान्यता प्राप्त चिकित्सा अर्हता होगी।

[संख्या की 11016/20/79/एम०ई० (नीति)]

मदन मोहन, अवर सचिव

S.O. 1329.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 14 of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 (102 of 1956), the Central Government after consultation with the Medical Council of India, hereby directs that the medical qualification M.D. (Far Eastern University, Manila, Philippines) shall be recognised medical qualification for the purposes of that Act.

[No. V. 11016/20/79-M.L. (Policy)]

MADAN MOHAN, Under Secy.

नॉबइन और परिचयन मंत्रालय

(अस पक्ष)

नई दिल्ली, अप्रैल 25, 1980

का० खा० 1330.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 9) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, मुम्बई डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) स्कीम, 1956 में और संशोधन करना चाहती है। जैसा कि उक्त धारा में अपेक्षित है, प्रस्तावित संशोधनों का निम्नलिखित प्रारूप उन सभी व्यक्तियों की जानकारी के लिए प्रकाशित किया जा रहा है, जिनके उससे प्रभावित होने की संभावना है। इसके द्वारा सूचना दी जाती है कि उक्त प्रारूप पर राजपत्र में इस अधिसूचना के प्रकाशन की तारीख से दो मास की अवधि के अवसान पर या उसके पश्चात् विचार किया जाएगा।

ऊपर विनिर्दिष्ट अवधि से पूर्व उक्त प्रारूप की बाबत जो भी आपत्तियाँ या सुझाव किसी व्यक्ति से प्राप्त होंगे, केन्द्रीय सरकार उन पर विचार करेगी।

1. इस स्कीम का नाम मुम्बई डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) संशोधन स्कीम, 1980 है।

2. मुम्बई कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) स्कीम, 1956 में,—

(1) खण्ड 3 में, उपखण्ड (ठ) के स्थान पर, निम्नलिखित उपखण्ड रखा जाएगा, अर्थात्:—

"(ठ) 'मासिक कर्मकार' से ऐसी रजिस्ट्रीकृत डाक कर्मकार अभिप्रेत हैं, जिसे किसी रजिस्ट्रीकृत नियोजक या ऐसे नियोजकों के समूह को स्थायी आधार पर या किसी विनिर्दिष्ट अवधि के लिए प्राबंठित किया गया है और वह उनके द्वारा मासिक आधार पर नियोजित किया गया है।"

(2) खण्ड 7 में, उपखण्ड (ट) के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित उपखण्ड रखा जाएगा, अर्थात्:—

"(ट) रजिस्ट्रीकृत डाक कर्मकारों के लिए भविष्य निधि और उपदान निधि का अनुसंधान और प्रशासन करना।"

(3) खण्ड 15 में उपखण्ड (2) की मध (ख) में, प्रविष्टि (i) के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि रखा जायेगी, अर्थात्:

"(i) मासिक रजिस्टर—ऐसे कर्मकारों का रजिस्टर, जिन्हें प्रत्येक रजिस्ट्रीकृत नियोजक या ऐसे नियोजकों के समूह को स्थायी आधार पर या किसी स्थायी अवधि के लिए प्राबंठित किया गया है और उन्हें जिनके द्वारा मासिक आधार पर नियोजित किया गया है तथा जो मासिक कर्मकारों के रूप में जाने जाते हैं।

(4) खण्ड 16 में, उपखण्ड 2 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित उपखण्ड रखा जाएगा अर्थात्:—

"(2) स्कीम के अधीन रजिस्ट्रीकृत डाक कर्मकारों को निम्नलिखित रूप में वर्गीकृत किया जाएगा:

(क) फोरमैन (जिसके अन्तर्गत प्रधान फोरमैन और सहायक फोरमैन भी हैं)।

(ख) चार्जमैन

(ग) स्टीवबोर टिण्डल

(घ) बिच ड्राइवर

(ङ) हेड फोरमैन

(च) खलासी

(छ) ज्येष्ठ स्टीवबोर कर्मकार

(झ) मिलान और छंटाई लिपिक।

(ञ) सफाई करने या झाड़ु लगाने वाला टोली टिंडल

(ट) गफाई करने वाला कर्मकार।

(ड) झाड़ु लगाने वाला कर्मकार।

(ड) स्टिचर।

(इ) सिलाई करने वाला।

(ई) स्थोरा पर्यवेक्षक।

(ण) सहायक स्थोरा पर्यवेक्षक।

(त) परिदान भारमाधक।

(थ) परिदान लिपिक।

(द) डाक लिपिक।

(घ) काष्ठकार।

(न) गोदाम खलासी।

(प) गियरमैन।"

(5) खण्ड 17 में, उपखण्ड (2) के स्थान पर, निम्नलिखित उपखण्ड रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

“(2) जब कोई रजिस्ट्रीकृत नियोजक या नियोजकों का कोई समूह अपने मासिक रजिस्टर में कर्मचारों की संख्या को बढ़ाना या घटाना चाहे, तो वह बोर्ड से उस आशय का अनुरोध करेगा। बोर्ड अपेक्षित अनिवार्य कर्मचारों का आबंटन करने या अधिशेष व्यक्तियों को रिजर्व पूल में आमेलित करने का प्रबन्ध करेगा।”

(6) खण्ड (18) में,—

(क) उपखण्ड (1) में, मद (क) के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित मद रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

“(क) कोई ऐसा डाक कर्मकार, जो स्कीम के प्रवर्तन की तारीख को मुख्य डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) स्कीम, 1951 के अधीन पहले ही रजिस्ट्रीकृत है या अनुसूची I में अब जोड़े गए प्रवर्गों से सम्बन्धित है और रजिस्ट्रीकृत नियोजक द्वारा स्थायी आधार पर नियोजित किया गया है, सभी प्रयोजनों के लिए सेवा की निरन्तरता सहित, इस स्कीम के अधीन रजिस्ट्रीकृत किया गया समझा जाएगा : परन्तु यदि किसी व्यक्ति के रजिस्ट्रीकरण की पात्रता के संबंध में कोई प्रश्न उठता है, तो बोर्ड द्वारा बैठक में इसका विनिर्णय किया जाएगा, जो अन्तिम होगा;”

(ख) उपखण्ड (2) को हटा दिया जाएगा;

(ग) उपखण्ड (7) के स्थान पर, निम्नलिखित उपखण्ड रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

“(7) उपखण्ड (1) की मद (ख) के अधीन रजिस्ट्रीकृत नए कर्मकार, रजिस्टर में स्थायी आधार पर दर्ज किए जाने के पूर्व एक वर्ष की अवधि के लिए परीक्षणीय होंगे।”

(7) खण्ड 27 में,—

(क) उपखण्ड (1) के स्थान पर, निम्नलिखित उपखण्ड रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

“(1) रिजर्व पूल में का रजिस्ट्रीकृत डाक कर्मकार अपना उपस्थिति कार्ड प्रशासनिक निकाय को उस समय सौंप देगा जब उसे रजिस्ट्रीकृत नियोजक के पास कार्य के लिए आवंटित किया जाता है। प्रशासनिक निकाय कर्मकार द्वारा किए गए कार्य की अवधि की बाबत उपस्थिति कार्ड में आवश्यक प्रविष्टियां करेगा और उक्त कार्ड को उसकी नियुक्ति के अवसान के पूर्व उसे वापस कर देगा;”

(ख) उपखण्ड (ख) को हटा दिया जाएगा;

(8) खण्ड 29 में, उपखण्ड (2) की मध (ग) को हटा दिया जाएगा।”

(9) खण्ड 30 में, उपखण्ड (2) के पश्चात्, निम्नलिखित उपखण्ड जोड़ा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

“(3) मासिक रजिस्टर में रजिस्ट्रीकृत कर्मचारों के किसी प्रवर्ग में आकस्मिक रिक्तियों तरसंबंधी प्रवर्गों से या रिजर्व पूल रजिस्टर में के अगले निम्नतर प्रवर्गों से भरी जाएगी।”

(10) खण्ड 37 में, उपखण्ड (5) के पश्चात्, निम्नलिखित उपखण्ड जोड़ा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

“(6) मासिक रजिस्टर में के रजिस्ट्रीकृत डाक कर्मकार को, ऐसे रजिस्ट्रीकृत नियोजक के, जिसे वह आवंटित किया गया है, नियोजन में समझा जाएगा।”

(11) खण्ड 52 में, उपखण्ड (1) के स्थान पर, निम्नलिखित उपखण्ड रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

“(1) बोर्ड, रजिस्ट्रीकृत डाक कर्मचारों के लिए अभिदायी भविष्य निधि और या पेंशन स्कीम के लिए उपबन्ध करने वाले नियम बनाएगा और उनका प्रवर्तन करेगा। नियमों में कर्मचारों और नियोजकों से अभिदाय की दर, संवाय की रीति और पद्धति तथा ऐसे अन्य विषयों के लिए, जो आवश्यक समझे जाएं, उपबन्ध किया जाएगा : परन्तु मासिक कर्मचारों को लागू नियम, रिजर्व पूल के कर्मचारों से संबंधित नियमों से कम अनुकूल नहीं होंगे :

परन्तु यह और कि किसी ऐसे प्रवर्ग के मासिक कर्मचारों की दशा में, जिन्हें अब अनुसूची I में जोड़ा गया है, और जो रजिस्ट्रीकृत नियोजकों द्वारा नियोजित हैं, किसी कर्मकार के जमा-खाते में पड़ी भविष्य निधि और पेंशन निधि की रकम बोर्ड को अन्तरित कर दी जाएगी तथा खण्ड (2) के अधीन राजपत्र में सरकार द्वारा विनिर्दिष्ट तारीख से बोर्ड में निहित हो जाएगा;”

(ख) उपखण्ड (2) के स्थान पर, निम्नलिखित उपखण्ड रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

“(2) बोर्ड, रजिस्ट्रीकृत कर्मचारों को उपदान का संदाय करने के लिए नियम बनाएगा;

परन्तु ऐसे नियम उपदान संदाय अधिनियम, 1972 और उसके अधीन बनाए गए नियमों के उपबन्धों से कम अनुकूल नहीं होंगे।

परन्तु यह और कि किसी ऐसे प्रवर्ग के मासिक कर्मचारों की दशा में, जिन्हें अनुसूची I में अब जोड़ा गया है और जो रजिस्ट्रीकृत नियोजकों द्वारा नियोजित हैं, इस खण्ड के अधीन राजपत्र में सरकार द्वारा विनिर्दिष्ट तारीख के पूर्व की गई सेवा के लिए उन्हें संदेय उपदान बोर्ड को अन्तरित कर दिया जाएगा तथा बोर्ड में निहित हो जाएगा।

(12) अनुसूची I के स्थान पर, निम्नलिखित अनुसूची रखी जाएगी, अर्थात् :—

“अनुसूची-I खण्ड 2(2) देखिए

ऐसे डाक कार्य और डाक कर्मचारों के, जिन्हें स्कीम लागू होती है, वर्ग या उनका विवरण :—

(1) कोयला, यात्री सामान और डाक कार्य से भिन्न नौभरण कार्य।

(2) स्टीवडोर कर्मचारों के निम्नलिखित प्रवर्गः—

- (क) फोरमैन (जिसके अन्तर्गत प्रधान फोरमैन और सहायक फोरमैन भी हैं) ।
- (ख) चार्जमैन ।
- (ग) स्टीवडोर टिन्डल ।
- (घ) विंच ड्राइवर ।
- (ङ) हूच फोरमैन ।
- (च) खलासी ।
- (छ) ज्येष्ठ स्टीवडोर कर्मकार ।
- (ज) मिलाई और छटाई लिपिक ।
- (झ) सफाई करने या झाड़ू लगाने वाला टोली टिन्डल ।
- (ञ) सफाई करने वाला कर्मकार ।
- (ट) झाड़ू लगाने वाला कर्मकार ।
- (ठ) स्टिचर ।
- (ड) मिलाई करने वाला ।
- (ढ) स्थोरा पर्यवेक्षक ।
- (ण) सहायक स्थोरा पर्यवेक्षक ।
- (त) परिधान भारसाधक ।
- (थ) परिधान लिपिक ।
- (द) डॉक लिपिक ।
- (ध) काष्ठकार ।
- (न) गोदाम खलासी ।
- (प) गियरमैन ।

[फा० सं० एन डी सी/11/80]

श्री० एन० रामचन्द्रा राव, प्रवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF SHIPPING & TRANSPORT

(Labour Wing)

New Delhi, the 25th April, 1980

S.O. 1330.—The following draft of a Scheme further to amend the Bombay Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1956 which the Central Government proposes to make in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1949), is hereby published as required by the said sub-section for the information of all persons likely to be affected thereby; and notice is hereby given that the said draft will be taken into consideration on or after the expiry of a period of two months from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette.

Any objections or suggestions which may be received from any person with respect to the said draft before the period so specified will be taken into consideration by the Central Government.

DRAFT SCHEME

1. This Scheme may be called the Bombay Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Amendment Scheme, 1980.

2. In the Bombay Dock Workers (Regulations of Employment) Scheme, 1956,—

(1) in clause 3, for sub-clause (d), the following sub-clause shall be substituted, namely :—

“(e) monthly worker means a registered dock worker who is allotted to a registered employer or a group of such employers, on a permanent basis or for a specified period, and employed by them on a monthly basis”.

(2) in clause 7 for sub-clause (k), the following sub-clause shall be substituted, namely :—

“(k) maintaining and administering a Provident Fund and a Gratuity Fund for registered Dock Workers”.

(3) in clause 15, in sub-clause (2), in item (b), for entry (i), the following entry shall be substituted, namely :—

“(i) Monthly Register.—Register of workers who are allotted to each registered employer or a group of such employers on a permanent basis or for a temporary period, and who are employed by them on monthly basis and who are known as monthly workers”.

(4) in clause 16, for sub-clause (2), the following sub-clause shall be substituted, namely :—

“(2) Dock Workers registered under the Scheme shall be classified into :—

- (a) Foreman (including Head Foreman and Assistant Foreman).
- (b) Chargeman.
- (c) Stevedore Tindel.
- (d) Winch Driver.
- (e) Hatchforeman.
- (f) Khalasi.
- (g) Stevedore Worker Senior.
- (h) Tally and Sorting Clerk.
- (i) Cleaning or Sweeping Gang Tindel.
- (j) Cleaning Worker.
- (k) Sweeping Worker.
- (l) Stitcher.
- (m) Sewingman.
- (n) Cargo Supervisor.
- (o) Assistant Cargo Supervisor.
- (p) Delivery Incharge.
- (q) Delivery Clerk.
- (r) Dock Clerk.
- (s) Carpenter.
- (t) Godown Khalasi.
- (u) Gearman.”

(5) in clause 17, for sub-clause (2), the following sub-clause shall be substituted, namely :—

“(2) When a registered employer or a group of employers want to increase or decrease the number of workers on his/its monthly register, they shall make a request to the Board to that effect. The Board shall arrange to allot the additional workers required or absorb the surplus in the reserve pool”.

(6) in clause 18, (a) in sub-clause (1), for item (a), the following item shall be substituted, namely :—

“(a) Any dock worker who, on the date of enforcement of the Scheme, is already registered under the Bombay Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1951, or any monthly worker in the categories now added to Schedule I, and employed by registered employer on a permanent basis, shall be deemed to have been registered under this Scheme, with continuity of service for all purposes ;

Provided that if any question regarding eligibility for registration of any person arises, it shall be decided by the Board in meeting, which shall be final”.

(b) sub-clause (2) shall be deleted ;

(c) for sub-clause (7), the following sub-clause shall be substituted namely :—

“(7) New workers registered under item (b) of sub-clause (1) will be on probation for a period of one year before being placed on a permanent basis on the register”.

- (7) in clause 27 (a) for sub-clause (1), the following sub-clause shall be substituted, namely :—
- “(1) A registered dock worker in the reserve pool shall handover to the Administrative Body at the time he is allotted for work to a registered employer his Attendance Card. The Administrative Body shall make necessary entries in the Attendance Card in respect of the period of work done by the worker and return it to him before the expiry of his engagement”;
- (b) sub-clause (b) shall be deleted.
- (8) in clause 29, sub-clause (2), item (c) shall be deleted.”
- (9) in clause 30, after sub-clause (2), the following sub-clause shall be added, namely :—
- “(3) Casual vacancies in any category of registered workers in the monthly register shall be filled up from the corresponding categories or from the next lower categories in the reserve pool register”;
- (10) in clause 37, after sub-clause (5), the following sub-clause shall be added, namely :—
- “(6) A registered dock worker in the monthly register shall be deemed to be in the employment of the registered employer to whom he is allotted”;
- (11) in clause 52, for sub-clause (1), the following sub-clause shall be substituted, namely :—
- “(1) The Board shall frame and operate rules providing for contributory provident fund and or pension scheme, for the registered dock workers. The rules shall provide for the rate of contribution from the workers and the employers, the manner and method of payment and such other matters as may be considered necessary :
- Provided that the rules applicable to monthly workers shall not be less favourable than these relating to workers in the reserve pool.
- Provided further that in the case of any category of monthly workers who are now added to the Schedule I, and who are employed by the Registered employers, the amounts of provident fund and pension fund standing to the credit of any such workers shall be transferred to the Board and shall be vested with the Board from the date specified by the Government in the Official Gazette under clause (2)”;
- (b) for sub-clause (2), the following sub-clause shall be substituted, namely :—
- “(2) The Board shall frame rules for payment of gratuity to registered workers ;
- Provided that such rules shall not be less favourable to the provisions of payment of Gratuity Act, 1972, and rules framed thereunder.
- Provided further that in the case of any category of monthly workers, who are now added to the Schedule I and who are employed by the registered employers, the gratuity payable to them for the service rendered prior to the date specified by the Government in the Official Gazette under this clause, shall be transferred to the Board and shall be vested in the Board.”
- (12) for Schedule I, the following Schedule shall be substituted, namely :—

“Schedule I See clause 2(2)

Classes or description of dock work and dock workers to which the Scheme applies :—

1. Stevedoring work other than coal, passenger baggage and mail work.

2. The following categories of stevedore workers :—

- (a) Foreman.
- (b) Chargeman.
- (c) Stevedore Tindal.
- (d) Winch Driver.
- (e) Hatchforeman.
- (f) Khalasi.
- (g) Stevedore Worker-Senior.
- (h) Tally & Sorting Clerk.
- (i) Cleaning or Sweeping gang tindal.
- (j) Cleaning Worker.
- (k) Sweeping Worker.
- (l) Stitcher.
- (m) Sewingman.
- (n) Cargo Supervisor.
- (o) Assistant Cargo Supervisor.
- (p) Delivery Incharge
- (q) Delivery Clerk.
- (r) Dock Clerk.
- (s) Carpenter.
- (t) Godown Khalasi.
- (u) Gearman.”

[File No. LDB/11/80]

V. N. RAMACHANDRA RAO, Under Secy.

निर्माण और आवास मंत्रालय

संघीय मिनेशालय

नई दिल्ली, 19 अप्रैल, 1980

का० आ० 1331.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, सरकारी स्थान (अप्राधिकृत अधिभागियों की देखरेख) अधिनियम, 1971 (1971 का 40) की धारा-3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, नीचे दी गई सारणी के स्तम्भ (1) में उल्लिखित अधिकारी को, जो सरकारी का राजपत्रित अधिकारी है, उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए संपदा अधिकारी नियुक्त करती है। वह उक्त सारणी के स्तम्भ (2) में विनिर्दिष्ट प्रवर्ग के सरकारी स्थानों की बाबत अपनी अधिकारिता की स्थानीय सीमाओं के भीतर उक्त अधिनियम द्वारा या उस के अधीन संपदा अधिकारी को प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग और अधिगोपित कर्तव्यों का पालन करेगा।

सारणी

अधिकारी का पदनाम	सरकारी स्थान
कार्यपालक इंजीनियर, बंगलौर केन्द्रीय खण्ड सं० 1, केन्द्रीय लोक निर्माण विभाग, बंगलौर	केन्द्रीय लोक निर्माण प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अधीन परिसर, जो बंगलौर केन्द्रीय खण्ड, केन्द्रीय लोक निर्माण विभाग की अधिकारिता के भीतर स्थित है।

[फाइल सं० 21012(3)/80-नीति-3]

भार० डी० भाटिया, संपदा उप-निदेशक (डी० और पी०)

MINISTRY OF WORKS & HOUSING

(Directorate of Estates)

New Delhi, the 19th April, 1980

S.O. 1331.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1971 (40 of 1971), the Central Government hereby appoints the officer mentioned in Column (1) of the Table below, being

a gazetted officer of Government, to be 'estate officer' for the purposes of said Act, who shall exercise the powers conferred, and perform the duties imposed, on estate officer by or under the said Act, within the local limits of his jurisdiction the respect of the category of the public premises specified in column (2) of the said Table.

TABLE

Designation of the officer	Public premises
1	2
The Executive Engineer, Bangalore Central Division, No. I, Central Public Works Department, Bangalore.	Premises under the administrative control of the Central Public Works Department situated within the Jurisdiction of Bangalore Central Division Central Public Works Department.

[File No. 21012(3)/80-Pol. III]

R. D. BHATIA, Deputy Director of Estates (D&P)

पर्यटन और नागर विमानन मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 25 अप्रैल, 1980

क्रा० आ० 1332.—अंतरराष्ट्रीय विमान पत्तन प्राधिकरण अधिनियम, 1971 (1971 का 43) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (3) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार निम्नलिखित को तत्काल तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए अथवा जब तक वे अपना पद त्याग नहीं देते, जो भी पहले हो, भारत अंतरराष्ट्रीय विमानपत्तन प्राधिकरण के अंशकालिक सदस्य नियुक्त करती है।

1. श्री रघुराज श्री जी० एस० दास के स्थान पर अध्यक्ष तथा प्रबन्ध निदेशक, एयर इंडिया, बम्बई।
2. श्री ए० एच० मेहता श्री जी० जी० मायूर के स्थान पर अध्यक्ष एवं प्रबन्ध निदेशक, इंडियन एयरलाइन्स, नई दिल्ली।

[सं० ए० बी० 24012/1/79-एए]
गोपाल चतुर्वेदी, उप सचिव

MINISTRY OF TOURISM AND CIVIL AVIATION

New Delhi, the 25th April, 1980

S.O. 1332.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-Section (3) of Section 3 of the International Airports Authority Act, 1971 (43 of 1971) The Central Government hereby appoints the following as part time members of the International Airports Authority of India, with immediate effect for a period of three years or till they demit their office, whichever is earlier :—

1. Shri Raghu Raj, Vice Shri B.S. Das.
Chairman and Managing Director, Air India, Bombay.
2. Shri A.H. Mehta, Vice Shri G.D. Mathur.
Chairman and Managing Director, Indian Airlines, New Delhi.

[No. AV 24012/1/79-AA]

GOPAL CHATURVEDI, Dy. Secy.

MINISTRY OF LABOUR

CORRIGENDA

New Delhi, the 23rd April, 1980

S.O. 1333.—In the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S. O. 4076, dated the 15th December, 1979, published in the Gazette of India at page 3593, Part-II Section-3 Sub-Section (ii) dated the 22nd December, 1979, at page 3593 in line 6 for "iron mines" read "iron ore mines".

[F. No. U. 23013/9/76-LW-Vol. II(I)]

S.O. 1334.—In the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S. O. 4077 dated the 15th December, 1979, published in the Gazette of India at page 3593, Part-II Section-3 Sub-Section (ii) at page 3593 in line 11 for "Over-barden removal" read "Over-burden removal".

[No. U. 23013/9/76-LW-Vol. II(II)]

R. KUNJITHAPADAM, Dy. Secy.

भावेन

नई दिल्ली, 23 अप्रैल, 1980

क्रा० आ० 1335.—भारत सरकार के श्रम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या क्रा० आ० 1721, तारीख 17 जुलाई, 1961 द्वारा गठित श्रम न्यायालय, मुम्बई महामदाबाद, के पीठासीन अधिकारी का पद रिक्त हो गया है।

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 8 के उपबन्धों के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री एस० के० कादरी को पूर्णकाल प्रकाश से गठित श्रम न्यायालय का पीठासीन अधिकारी नियुक्त करती है।

[फाइल संख्या-एस-11020/3/80-डी० आई० (ए)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 23rd April, 1980

S.O. 1335.—Whereas a vacancy has occurred in the Office of the Presiding Officer of the Labour Court, with headquarters at Ahmedabad constituted by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S. O. 1721 dated the 17th July, 1961;

Now therefore in pursuance of the provisions of section 8 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri S. K. Kadri, as the Presiding Officer of the Labour Court constituted as aforesaid.

[File No. S-11020/3/80/DI(A)]

क्रा० आ० 1336.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि लोकहित में ऐसा करना अपेक्षित था, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (इ) के उपखण्ड (vi) के उपबन्धों के अनुसरण में भारत सरकार के श्रम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या क्रा० आ० 3839 तारीख 6 नवम्बर, 1979 द्वारा किसी भी भायल फील्ड की सेवा को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए 10 नवम्बर, 1979 से छः मास की कालावधि के लिए लोक उपयोगी सेवा घोषित किया था,

और केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि उक्त कालावधि को छः मास की और कालावधि के लिए बढ़ाया जाना अपेक्षित है;

अतः अब औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (इ) के उपखण्ड (vi) के परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए 10 मई, 1980 से छः मास की और कालावधि के लिए लोक उपयोगी सेवा घोषित करती है।

[सं० एस०-11017/5/80-डी०-1 (ए)]

एस० के० नारायणन, अवर सचिव

S.O. 1336.—Whereas the Central Government having been satisfied that the public interest so required had, in pursuance of the provisions of sub-clause (vi) of clause (n) of section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), declared by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S. O. 3839 dated the 6th November, 1979, the Service in any oilfield to be a public utility service for the purposes of the said Act, for a period of six months, from the 10th November, 1979;

And whereas, the Central Government is of opinion that public interest requires the extension of the said period by a further period of six months;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to sub-clause (vi) of clause (n) of section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby declares the said industry to be a public utility service for the purposes of the said Act, for a further period of six months from the 10th May, 1980.

[No. S-11017/5/80-DI(A)]

L. K. NARYANAN, Under Secy.

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 23 अप्रैल, 1980

का० आ० 1337:—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाज्ज अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में कोओपरेटिव बैंक आफ अहमदाबाद से संबंधित नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकार श्री ए० बी० पटेल, चपरासी के बीच औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्याय निर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना बांछनीय समझती है;

अतः अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (च) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण का गठन करती है, जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री आर० सी० इसराणी होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय अहमदाबाद में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त औद्योगिक अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या कोओपरेटिव बैंक आफ अहमदाबाद लिमिटेड, अहमदाबाद द्वारा श्री ए० बी० पटेल, चपरासी की सेवाओं को 1 दिसम्बर, 1976 से समाप्त करना न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुसूची का हकदार है?

[सं० एल-12012/13/79-डी० II (ए०)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 23rd April, 1980

S.O. 1337.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Cooperative Bank of Ahmedabad and their workman Shri A. B. Patel, Peon in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A, and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri R. C. Israni shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Ahmedabad and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

Whether the Cooperative Bank of Ahmedabad Limited, Ahmedabad, is justified in terminating the services of Shri A. B. Patel, Peon with effect from 1st December, 1976? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled?

[No. L-12012/13/79-D. II(A)]

New Delhi, the 29th April, 1980

S.O. 1338.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. 3, Dhanbad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bank of Baroda, Patna and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 23rd April, 1980.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT NO. 3 DHANBAD

Reference No. 50 of 1979

PRESENT :

Shri P. Ramakrishna, Presiding Officer.

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Bank of Baroda, Patna.

AND

Their workman.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—S/Sri L. N. Basak & D. Mukherjee.

For the Workman—Sri P. C. Verma, Vice-President of Bihar Provisional Bank Employees Assn.

INDUSTRY : Bank

STATE : Bihar

Dated, the 17th April, 1980

AWARD

The Government of India in the Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them U/S 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 14 of 1947 have referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication as per their Order No. L-12011/52/78-DIIA dated the 23rd 25th October, 1978.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Bank of Baroda, Patna in depriving Shri Gopal Narain Lal of the post of Head Cashier Category 'A' and special allowance being paid to him for the performance of the duties of Head Cashier w.e.f. 4-11-77 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?"

2. On behalf of the concerned workman (referred to hereinafter as workman) The Bihar State Bank of Baroda Employees Association has filed a written statement of claim stating that the workman who is a Science Graduate joined service in the Bank of Baroda (hereinafter referred to as the Bank) as a Clerk on 1-6-71. He was promoted to the post of Head Cashier (Category 'A') taking into account his seniority and suitability as per the order dated 24-5-76. This post of Head Cashier carries a Special Allowance of Rs. 33/- per month which with D.A. comes to Rs. 85/- to 100/- per month. It is contended that this order giving him the post of Head Cashier is unconditional and does not suggest that it is temporary. The Bank did not also reserve any right to revert the workman to his original post at its discretion. The workman drew the special allowance even during the

period he was on leave, which he would not have been able to do had his posting as Head Cashier been on a temporary basis. Yet the Bank issued an order on 3-11-77 asking him to hand over charge as Head Cashier to Sri R. S. Ram. It is submitted that because the said Sri R. S. Ram was a member of the I.N.B.E.C. affiliated Union, the management favoured him with this post at the expense of the workman who belongs to the rival union. This action of the management is characterised as mischievous and misleading and opposed to the provisions of para 5.289 of the Desai Award and para 5.9 of the First Bipartite Settlement which lay down that an employee cannot be arbitrarily deprived of the special allowance. It is claimed that the workman discharged his functions as Head Cashier without a blemish. The dispute was referred to the A.L.C. (C) Patna for his intervention. On his submitting a failure report the present reference is made. The union prays that the workman may be reinstated in his original post with effect from 3-11-77 with full arrears of the special allowance.

3. The Bank filed a written statement stating that an employee is entitled to payment of special allowance for a special job entrusted to him. It is claimed that in its discretion the Bank can decide to whom and for how long the special duties carrying special allowance should be assigned. According to them the workman has no right to the post of Head Cashier. It is further pleaded the additional duties of Head Cashier are entrusted to the seniormost Cash Clerk of the City (Patna) or Bihar State after notifying the vacancy to all the Branches in the State. This procedure was not followed in the case of the workman when he was asked to work as Head Cashier. Sri R. S. Ram being the senior most Clerk in the city he was asked to take over the duties of Head Cashier with effect from 3-11-77. The action of the management in posting Sri R. S. Ram as the Head Cashier in place of the workman is said to be proper and justified and in accordance with the provisions of the Awards and Bipartite Settlements. It is their further case that the appointment of Sri R. S. Ram, Special Assistant to perform the duties of a Head Cashier in addition to his other duties is consistent with the provisions of para 5.5 of Bipartite Settlement. They submit that the grievance of the workman is imaginary and not real or justified.

4. The union in their rejoinder inter-alia deny the averment that the workman's appointment as Head Cashier was temporary. They dispute the Bank's claim that the correct procedure for filling in the post of a Head Cashier is not followed. They assert that Sri R. S. Ram was not the senior most Cash Clerk on the date he was appointed as Head Cashier in place of the workman. He was a Special Assistant.

5. The issues that arise for consideration on the above pleadings are—

(1) Whether the action of the Bank in reverting the workman to the post of a Cashier with effect from 3-11-77 is justified?

(2) To what relief?

6. Issue (1)—The workman who is a Science Graduate joined service in the Bank of Baroda, Patna Branch as a Cash Clerk-cum-Godown Keeper on 1-6-71. On 24-5-76 as per the Order Ext. W-1 given below he was asked to take charge of the Cash Department with effect from the close of the business on that day on payment of Special Allowance under Category 'A' which along with D.A. comes to Rs. 85 to 100 per month.

"Under instructions from our Regional Manager (BOAM), Calcutta, you are hereby instructed to take charge of the Cash Department of our Branch and to hold the keys of the Safe jointly with the Accountant with effect from the close of the business of 24th May, 1976.

Please note that you will be eligible to draw the allowance under the Category 'A' for the above-mentioned work.

Yours faithfully,
Sd./ C. R. TASKAR,
Acting Manager"

As per Ext. W-2 the order dated 3-11-77 given below the workman was instructed to hand over charge of the Cash Department to Sri R. S. Ram, Special Assistant of the Bank, Patna :

"Further to our letter dated 24th May, 1976 as per instructions from our Regional Manager (BONE), Calcutta, you are hereby instructed to hand over charge of the Cash Department and key of the safes to Mr. R. S. Ram, permanent Head Cashier of the Branch as at the close of business on 3rd November, 1977.

Please note that you will continue to perform the duties of Cash Clerk as per provisions of your appointment order and shall cease to draw any special allowance.

Yours faithfully,
Sd./- Illegible
Senior Manager"

The Order Ext. W-3 dt. 3-11-77 appointing Sri R. S. Ram as Head Cashier is also given below :

"Under instructions from our Regional Manager (BONE), Calcutta you are instructed to take charge of cash department of our branch and also to hold keys of the safe jointly with the Accountant with effect from 3-11-1977.

Yours faithfully,
Sd/-
Senior Manager"

The case of the workman is that having been appointed as Head Cashier unconditionally as per the order Ext. W-1, he should not have been reverted to the post of Cashier with effect from 3-11-1977 for no reason whatsoever. He says his work as Head Cashier during this period was without blemish. According to the union that sponsored his case, the Bank has no right to withdraw the Special Allowance at its sweet will and pleasure. The Bank's case is that they have got the right to call upon any person to discharge certain special functions which carry special allowance for such time as they please. In this case the Bank asked the workman to discharge the functions of a Head Cashier till 3-11-1977 and thereafter thought it fit to allow one Sri R. S. Ram, Special Asstt. to take charge of that post besides his normal duties. It may be noticed that Sri R. S. Ram, Special Asstt. was getting Rs. 91 special allowance in his capacity as Special Asstt. When he was called upon to discharge the functions of a Head Cashier he was entitled to claim the higher of the two special allowances, the two posts carried and not both the special allowances. Consequently on being asked to discharge the functions of Incharge of Cash Department Sri R. S. Ram would get Rs. 91 as per the terms of para 5.5 of the Bipartite Settlement. The points that arise for consideration are whether the workman's appointment as Head Cashier is a sort of a stop gap arrangement as pleaded by the Bank and if not whether the Bank is justified in withdrawing the special functions of a Head Cashier from the workman arbitrarily. It may also be noticed that on 24-5-1976 the workman was posted as Head Cashier in place of Sri R. S. Ram and again the workman was asked to hand over charge of Head Cashier to the said R. S. Ram as per the Order Ext. W-2. Sri R. S. Ram is the seniormost Clerk and the workman is next to him in the order of seniority. The order of appointment Ext. W-1 does not support the contention of the Bank that the posting of the workman as a Head Cashier on 24-5-1976 was a stop gap arrangement or was on a temporary basis. The working of Ext. W-1 the order of posting the workman as Head Cashier and that of Ext. W-3 posting Shri R. S. Ram in his place are identical. The Bank claims that as per the order Ext. W-3 R. S. Ram was appointed on a permanent basis and not the workman as per the order Ext. W-1. This contention cannot be accepted on a reading of Ext. W-1 & Ext. W-3. Another clinching clue to show that the Bank in fact appointed the workman as Head Cashier on a permanent basis is the admitted fact that the workman was allowed to draw the special allowance attached to that post during the period he went on leave. Para 5.10 of the First Bipartite Settlement states that the special allowance would continue to be drawn by a permanent incumbent while on leave. This

privilege is denied to a workman who is asked to work temporarily in a post carrying special allowance. The leave account of the workman Ext. W-4 and the register of wages Ext. W-5 clearly show that even during the period the workman went on leave he had drawn this special allowance of a Head Cashier. From this circumstance and on a reading of the order of appointment it has to be held that the Bank appointed the workman as a Head Cashier on a regular basis and not as a stop-gap arrangement on a temporary basis. The case of the Bank that the prescribed procedure was not followed in appointing the workman as a Head Cashier cannot also be accepted. In para 10 of their written statement the Bank has stated that the assignment of additional duties specially for the Head Cashier is made to the senior most Cash Clerk in the city or in the State after issuing a circular notifying the vacancy to all the Branches in the State. Since the appointment of the workman was absolutely a stop-gap arrangement this procedure was not followed. Sri R. S. Raim who was posted as Head Cashier is placed in charge of Cash as per the Order Ext. W-3 being the senior most Cash Clerk in the city. His appointment is therefore proper. In support of this case a circular dated 6-12-1977 issued to all Branches in Bihar State notifying the vacancies of Head Cashiers in the 14 proposed new branches is filed. This document does not show that the same procedure was required to be followed in May 1976 when the order Ext. W-1 posting the workman as Head Cashier was passed. On the other hand on behalf of the workman WW-1 Sri R. P. Mandal, the Head Cashier of Gulab-bagh Branch is examined to show that no applications were called for for filling in this post of Head Cashier at the time of his appointment. No circular was issued by the Bank notifying this vacancy. He was orally asked by the Branch Manager to take charge as Head Cashier from the previous incumbent Sri B. B. Dey who was transferred. Thereafter an order of appointment was given by the Manager appointing him as Head Cashier on a temporary basis. From 21-1-1971 upto-date he says he has been working as Head Cashier. The facts spoken to by him in his chief examination are not attempted to be controverted in his cross-examination. From this it has to be held that the Bank has failed to establish their case that there was a procedure prescribed for filling the post of a Head Cashier and in the case of the workman it has not been followed because his posting as per the Order Ext. W-1 was meant to be a stop-gap arrangement.

7. The next point that has to be considered is whether the Bank has a right to withdraw the special functions carrying special allowance from any of its employees at its discretion. In para 5,289 of Desai Award it is stated that a person who is employed permanently as a Head Clerk or as a Stenographer cannot be deprived of such special allowance at the sweet will and pleasure of the Bank by asking him to work as an ordinary Clerk or not to work as Stenographer. This observation applies with equal force to the facts of the present case also. The Bank cannot appoint the workman on a regular basis as a Head Cashier on one day and then withdraw the special functions for no reason whatsoever after a period of one year.

8. For the aforesaid reasons Issue (1) held against the management.

9. Issue (2)—In view of the finding on Issue (1) this reference is answered as follows:

The action of the management in depriving the workman of the post of Head Cashier, Category 'A' and consequently the Special Allowance attached to the post with effect from 4-11-1977 is not justified. The management is directed to reinstate the workman in the said post of Head Cashier with effect from 4-11-1977 with all consequential benefits.

P. RAMAKRISHNA, Presiding Officer

[No. L-12011/52/78-D.II.A]

S. K. BISWAS, Desk Officer

New Delhi, the 23rd April, 1980

S.O. 1339.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, in the industrial dispute

between the employers in relation to the management of Burhar Sub-Area of Western Coalfield Limited, Post Office Amlai, District Shahdol and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 16th April, 1980.

BEFORE SHRI A. G. QURESHI, M.A., LL.B., PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-

CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Case.No. CGIT/LC(R)(10)/1980

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the Management of Burhar Sub-Area of Western Coalfields Limited, Post Office, Amlai, District Shahdol and their workmen represented through the General Secretary, Shahdol Jilla Janta Koyla Khan Mazdoor Sangh, Post Office Dhanpuri, District Shahdol (M.P.).

APPEARANCES :

For Union.—Shri D. L. Agarwal.

For Management.—Shri P. S. Nair, Advocate and Shri S. M. Singh, Personnel Manager.

INDUSTRY : Coal

DISTRICT : Shahdol (M.P.)

AWARD

By an Order No. L-22012/20/78-D.IV(A) dated 19th/21st February, 1980, the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, in exercise of the powers conferred by Clause 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute to this Tribunal, for adjudication:—

"Keeping in view the circumstances under which Shri Abdul Latif, Burhar No. 3 Mine of Burhar Sub-Area of Western Coalfields Limited, was prevented from attending duties with effect from 26th June, 1975 to 3rd February, 1977, whether the action of the management of Burhar Sub-Area, in denying him back wages for the above period is justified? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled?"

2. Both the parties to the dispute were noticed to file their respective statement of claim on 1-4-1980, on which date the representatives of both the parties appeared and filed a Memorandum of settlement with a request that an award be passed in terms of the settlement arrived at between the parties. They have further verified the terms of the settlement. The terms of Settlement incorporated in the Memorandum of Settlement are as under:—

- (1) The management will pay 40 per cent of the back wages for the period from 26th June 1975 to 3rd February 1977 to Shri Abdul Latif on the basis of pay drawn by him at the time of termination, in full and final settlement of all the claims of the workman.
- (2) The Union unconditionally accept the terms and conditions offered by the management and give up all their claims for the 60 per cent of the back wages or any other relief from the management.
- (3) This settlement settles all the dispute between the management and the Union and Shri Abdul Latif as far as his case is concerned. Neither the Union nor the workman or any other Union shall take up any dispute of this workman pertaining to this dispute.
- (4) The parties shall bear their own cost.

In my opinion the aforementioned terms of settlement are fair, reasonable and beneficial to the workman. I, therefore, record my award in terms of the settlement. The Memorandum of Settlement shall form part of the award.

Dated : 3-4-1980.

A. G. QURESHI, Presiding Officer

[No. L-22012(20)/78-D.IV(A)]

FORM 'H'

(Sec Rule 58)

Form for Memorandum of Settlement

Representing employers.—Shri S. M. Singh, Personnel Manager, Sohagpur Area, Western Coalfields Ltd.

Representing workmen.—Shri D. L. Agarwal, General Secretary, Shahdol Zilla Janta Koyala Khan Mazdoor Sangh.

Short Recital of the case

1. The General Secretary, Shahdol Zilla Janta Koyala Khan Mazdoor Sangh took up the question of payment of back wages of Shri Abdul Latif, Burhar No. 3 Mine of Burhar Sub Area for the period from 26th June 1975 to 3rd February 1977 before the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central), Shahdol. The management appeared before the A.L.C. and submitted that the workman is not entitled to any wages for the period he was not in employment. It was also submitted that the services of the workman came to an automatic end in terms of clause 17(ii) of the Certified Standing Orders of the Company. Ultimately, the following Reference was referred by the Central Government under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur.

"Keeping in view the circumstances under which Shri Abdul Latif Burhar No. 3 Mine of Burhar Sub Area of Western Coalfields Limited, was prevented from attending duties with effect from 26th June 1975 to 3rd February 1977, whether the action of the management of Burhar Sub Area, in denying him back wages for the above period is justified? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled?"

2. After the matter was referred the management and the Union had held detailed discussions. Without prejudice to the contention of the management that the Reference is bad in law and the workman is not entitled to any back wages, as a measure of goodwill, the management has agreed to settle the dispute on the following terms :—

Terms of Settlement

- (1) The management will pay 40 per cent of the back-wages for the period from 26th June 1975 to 3rd February 1977 to Shri Abdul Latif on the basis of pay drawn by him at the time of termination, in full and final settlement of all the claims of the workman.
- (2) The Union unconditionally accept the terms and conditions offered by the management and give up all their claims for the 60 per cent of the back wages or any other relief from the management.
- (3) This settlement settles all the dispute between the management and the Union and Shri Abdul Latif as far as his case is concerned. Neither the Union nor the workman or any other Union shall take up any dispute of this workman pertaining to this dispute.
- (4) The parties shall bear their own cost.

3. The parties submit that on the facts and circumstances of the case, the settlement is fair and reasonable and the workman shall be paid 40 per cent of wages for the period in question even though he did not work during that period.

4. The parties shall file a copy of this settlement before the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur and pray for an Award in terms of the settlement.

This settlement shall not be treated as precedent.

Jabalpur,

Dated : 1-4-1980.

Representing employers : S. M. SINGH
Representing Union : D. L. Agarwal.

PART OF AWARD

Sd/-

(A. G. Qureshi)

Presiding Officer.

S.O. 1340.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Burhar Sub-Area, District Shahdol (M.P.) and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 16th April, 1980.

BEFORE SHRI A. G. QURESHI, M.A., LL.B PRESIDING OFFICER CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL-TRIBUNAL CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Case of CGIT/IC(R)(19)/1979

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Sub-Area Manager, Burhar Sub-Area of Western Coalfields Limited, District Shahdol and their workmen represented through the General Secretary, Shahdol Zilla Janta Koyala Khan Mazdoor Sangh, P.O. Dhanpuri, District Shahdol (M.P.)

APPEARANCES :

For Union—Shri D. L. Agarwal.

For Management—Shri P. S. Nair, Advocate.

District : Shahdol (M.P.)

INDUSTRY : Coal.

AWARD

By an order No. L-22012(21)/78-D.IV(A) dated 21st August, 1979, the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :—

"Keeping in view the circumstances under which Shri Abdul Samad, son of Shri Abdul Jalil, Haulage Khalasi, Burhar No. 1 Incline of Messrs Western Coalfields Limited, P.O. Dhanpuri, was prevented from attending duties with effect from the 26th June, 1975 to 3rd February, 1977, whether the action of the management of Burhar Sub-Area, P.O. Amlai, District Shahdol, in denying him back wages for the above period is justified? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled?"

2. After the pleadings and documents were filed by the parties the case was fixed for evidence on 1-4-1980. Both the representatives of the parties appeared on 1-4-1980 and instead of adducing evidence they have submitted a Memorandum of Settlement incorporating therein the terms of settlement. Parties have verified the terms of settlement before the Tribunal on 1-4-1980. The parties have further prayed in para 4 of the Memorandum of Settlement that an award be passed in terms of the settlement.

3. I have gone through the terms of the settlement. The management has agreed to pay 40 per cent of the back wages to the workman Shri Abdul Jalil on the basis of pay drawn by him at the time of termination, in full and final settlement of all his claim. The Union unconditionally accepted the terms and conditions offered by the management and gave up all their claims for the 60 per cent of the workman's back wages or any other relief from the management. The aforementioned terms and conditions of the settlement appears to be fair, reasonable and beneficial to the workman concerned and the Union. As such I give my award in terms of the settlement which shall form part of the award.

Dated : 7-4-1980.

[No. L-22012(21)/78-D.IV(A)]

A. G. QURESHI, Presiding Officer

FORM 'H'

(See Rule 58)

Form for Memorandum of Settlement

Representing employers.—Shri S. M. Singh, Personnel Manager, Sohagpur Area, Western Coalfields Ltd.

Representing workmen.—Shri D. L. Aggarwal, General Secretary, Shahdol Zilla Janta Koyala Khan Mazdoor Sangh.

Short Recital of the Case

1. The General Secretary, Shahdol Zilla Janta Koyala Khan Mazdoor Sangh took up the question of payment of back-wages of Shri Abdul Samad, son of Shri Abdul Jalil, Haulage Khalasi, Burhar No. 1 Incline for the period from 26th June, 1975 to 3rd February, 1977 before the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central), Shahdol. The management appeared before this A.L.C. and submitted that the workman is not entitled to any wages for the period he was not in employment. It was also submitted that the services of the workman came to an automatic end in terms of Clause 17(ii) of the Certified Standing Orders of the Company. Ultimately, the following Reference was referred by the Central Government under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur.

"Keeping in view the circumstances under which Shri Abdul Samad, son of Shri Abdul Jalil, Haulage Khalasi, Burhar No. 1 incline of Messrs Western Coalfields Limited, P.O. Dhanpuri, was prevented from attending duties with effect from the 26th June 1975 to 3rd February 1977, whether the action of the management of Burhar Sub-Area, P.O. Amlai, District Shahdol, in denying him back wages for the above period is justified? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled?"

2. After the matter was referred the management and the Union had held detailed discussions. Without prejudice to the contention of the management that the Reference is bad in law and the workman is not entitled to any backwages, as a measure of goodwill, the management has agreed to settle the dispute on the following terms :—

Terms of Settlement

- (1) The management will pay 40 per cent of the back-wages for the period from 26th June 1975 to 3rd February to Shri Abdul Samad, son of Shri Abdul Jalil on the basis of pay drawn by him at the time of termination, in full and final settlement of all the claims of the workman.
- (2) The Union unconditionally accept the terms and conditions offered by the management and give up all their claim for the 60 per cent of the backwages or any other relief from the management.
- (3) This settlement settles all the dispute between the management and the Union and Shri Abdul Samad, son of Abdul Jalil as far as his case is concerned. Neither the Union for the workman or any other Union shall take up any dispute of this workman pertaining to this dispute.

- (4) The parties shall bear their own cost.

3. The parties submit that on the facts and circumstances of the case, the settlement is fair and reasonable and the workman shall be paid 40 per cent of wages for the period in question even though he did not work during that period.

4. The parties shall file a copy of this Settlement before the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur and pray for an Award in terms of the Settlement.

This Settlement shall not be treated as precedent.

Representing employers : S. M. Singh

Representing Union : D. L. Aggarwal

Jabalpur : 1-4-1980.

PART OF AWARD

Sd/-

(A. G. QURESHI)

Presiding Officer

S.O. 1341.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Burhar Sub Area of Western Coalfields Limited, Post Office Amlai, District Shahdol (M.P.) and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 16th April, 1980.

BEFORE SHRI A. G. QURESHI, M.A., LL.B., PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Case No. GGIT/LC(R)(9)/1980

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Burhar Sub-Area of Western Coalfields Limited, Post Office Amlai, District Shahdol and their workmen through the General Secretary, Shahdol Zilla Janta Koyala Khan Mazdoor Sangh Post Office Dhanpuri, District Shahdol (M.P.).

APPEARANCES :

For Union.—Shri D. L. Agarwal for the Union.

For Management.—Shri P. S. Nair, Advocate, and Shri S. M. Singh, Personnel Manager.

INDUSTRY : Coal

DISTRICT : Shahdol (M.P.)

AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-22012/22/78-D. IV(A) dated 19th February, 1980, has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal, for adjudication :

"Keeping in view the circumstances under which Shri Ram Prasad S/o Shri Phool Chand of Burhar Sub Area of Western Coalfields Limited was prevented from attending duties with effect from the 26th June, 1975 to 3rd February, 1977, whether the action of the management of Burhar Sub-Area, in denying him back wages for the above period is justified? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled?"

2. On receipt of the reference order dated 19-2-80 from the Ministry of Labour, Government of India, the parties were noticed to file their respective statement of claim on 1-4-1980. The representatives of the parties appeared on 1-4-1980 and have submitted a Memorandum of Settlement with the request that an award be passed in terms of the settlement. Both the parties have verified the terms of settlement.

3. I have gone through the terms of the settlement by which the management has agreed to pay 40 per cent of the back wages for the period from 26th June 1975 to 3rd February, 1977 to the workman concerned, Shri Ram Prasad, on the basis of pay drawn by him at the time of termination and the Union unconditionally agreed to accept the terms and conditions offered by the management and give up all their claims for the remaining 60 per cent of the back wages or any other relief. The terms of settlement appear to be fair, reasonable and beneficial to the workman; hence an award is given accordingly. The Memorandum of Settlement shall form part of the award.

DATED : 3-4-1980

A. G. QURESHI, Presiding Officer
[No. L-22012(23)/78-D. IV(A)]

FORM 'H'

(See Rule 58)

Form for Memorandum of Settlement

Representing employers.—Shri S. M. Singh, Personnel Manager, Sohagpur Area, Western Coalfields Ltd.

Representing workmen.—Shri D. L. Agarwal, General Secretary, Shahdol Zilla Janta Koyala Khan Mazdoor Sangh.

Short Recital of the Case

1. The General Secretary, Shahdol Zilla Janta Koyala Khan Mazdoor Sangh took up the question of payment of back wages of Shri Ram Prasad S/o Shri Phool Chand of Burhar Sub Area for the period from 26th June, 1975 to 3rd February, 1977 before the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central), Shahdol. The management appeared before the A.I.C. and submitted that the workman is not entitled to any wages for the period he was not in employment. It was also submitted that the services of the workman came to an automatic end in terms of Clause 17(ii) of the Certified Standing Orders of the Company. Ultimately, the following reference was referred by the Central Government under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur.

"Keeping in view the circumstances under which Shri Ram Prasad S/o Shri Phool Chand of Burhar Sub Area of Western Coalfields Limited was prevented from attending duties with effect from the 26th June 1975 to 3rd February, 1977, whether the action of the management of Burhar Sub Area, in denying him back wages for the above period is justified? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled?"

2. After the matter was referred the management and the Union had held detailed discussions. Without prejudice to the contention of the management that the Reference is bad in law and the workman is not entitled to any backwages, as a measure of goodwill, the management has agreed to settle the dispute on the following terms :—

Terms of Settlement

- (1) The management will pay 40 per cent of the backwages for the period from 26th June 1975 to 3rd February 1977 to Shri Ram Prasad, S/o Shri Phool Chand on the basis of pay drawn by him at the time of termination, in full and final settlement of all the claims of the workman.
 - (2) The Union unconditionally accept the terms and conditions offered by the management and give up all their claims for the 60 per cent of the backwages or any other relief from the management.
 - (3) This settlement settles all the dispute between the management and the Union and Shri Ram Prasad S/o Shri Phool Chand as far as his case is concerned. Neither the Union nor the workman or any other Union shall take up any dispute of this workman pertaining to this dispute.
 - (4) The parties shall bear their own cost.
3. The parties submit that on the facts and circumstances of the case, the settlement is fair and reasonable and the workman shall be paid 40 per cent of wages for the period in question even though he did not work during that period.
4. The parties shall file a copy of this settlement before the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur and pray for an Award in terms of the Settlement.

This settlement shall not be treated as precedent.

Jabalpur,

Dated : 1-4-1980.

Representing employers : S. M. Singh.

Representing Union : D. L. Agarwal.

PART OF AWARD

(A. G. Qureshi)

Presiding Officer.

S.O. 1342.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Burhar Sub-Area of Coal India Ltd. Post Office Amlai, District Shahdol (M.P.) and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 16th April, 1980.

BEFORE SHRI A. G. QURESHI, M.A. LL.B., PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CPM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Case No. GGIT/LC(E)(12)/1980

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Burhar Sub-Area of Coal India Limited, Post Office Amlai, District Shahdol and their workmen represented through the General Secretary, Shahdol Zilla Janta Koyala Khan Mazdoor Sangh, Post Office Dhanpuri, District Shahdol (M.P.).

APPEARANCES :

For Union.—Shri D. L. Agarwal.

For Management.—Shri P. S. Nair, Advocate and Shri S. M. Singh, Personnel Manager.

INDUSTRY : Coal

DISTRICT : Shahdol (M.P.)

AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (d) of Sub-Section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, has referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal vide Order No. I-22012/23/78-D.IV(A) dated 19th February, 1980, for adjudication :—

"Keeping in view the circumstances under which Shri Manno Singh S/o Shri Chheda Singh, General Mazdoor of Amlai Colliery was prevented from attending duties with effect from the 26th June, 1975 to 3rd February, 1977, whether the action of the management of Burhar Sub-Area in denying him back wages for the above period is justified? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled?"

2. The management and the union were issued notices to appear and file their respective statement of claim. On the first date i.e. 1-4-1980 the representatives of both the parties appeared and filed a Memorandum of Settlement incorporating the terms of settlement therein. In para 6 of the Memorandum of Settlement the parties have prayed the Tribunal to give an award in terms of the settlement arrived at between the parties.

3. I have gone through the terms of settlement and am of the opinion that the terms so incorporated in the Memorandum of Settlement are fair, reasonable and beneficial to the workman concerned, Shri Manno Singh, and the Union. I, therefore, pass an award in terms of the settlement which shall form part of the award.

Dated : 5-4-1980

A. G. QURESHI, Presiding Officer

[No. L-22012(23)/78-D.IV(A)]

FORM 'H'

(See Rule 58)

Form for Memorandum of Settlement

Representing employers.—Shri S. M. Singh, Personnel Manager, Sohagpur Area, Western Coalfields Ltd.

Representing workman.—Shri D. L. Agarwal, General Secretary, Shahdol Zilla Janta Koyala Khan Mazdoor Sangh.

Short Recital of the Case

1. The General Secretary, Shahdol Zilla Janta Koyala Khan Mazdoor Sangh took up the question of payment of back-wages of Shri Mannoo Singh, S/o Shri Chheda Singh, General Mazdoor of Amlai Colliery for the period from 26th June, 1975 to 3rd February, 1977 before the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central) Shahdol. The management appeared before the A.L.C. and submitted that the workman is not entitled to any wages for the period he was not in employment. It was also submitted that the services of the workman came to an automatic end in terms of Clause 17(ii) of the Certified Standing Orders of the Company. Ultimately, the following Reference was referred by the Central Government under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur,

"Keeping in view the circumstances under which Shri Mannoo Singh, S/o Shri Chheda Singh, General Mazdoor of Amlai Colliery was prevented from attending duties with effect from the 26th June, 1975 to 3rd February, 1977, whether the action of the management of Burhar Sub-Area, in denying him back wages for the above period is justified? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled?"

2. After the matter was referred, the management and the Union had held detailed discussions. Without prejudice to the contention of the management that the Reference is bad in law and the workman is not entitled to any back wages as a measure of goodwill, the management has agreed to settle the dispute on the following terms :—

Terms of Settlement

- (1) The management will pay 40 per cent of the back-wages for the period from 26th June, 1975 to 3rd February, 1977 to Shri Mannoo Singh, S/o Shri Chheda Singh on the basis of pay drawn by him at the time of termination, in full and final settlement of all the claims of the workman.
- (2) The Union unconditionally accept the terms and conditions offered by the management and give up all their claims for the 60 per cent of the backwages or any other relief from the management.

3. The parties submit that on the facts and circumstances of the case, the settlement is fair and reasonable and the workman shall be paid 40 per cent of wages for the period in question even though he did not work during that period.

4. This settlement settles all the dispute between the management and the Union and Shri Mannoo Singh, S/o Shri Chheda Singh as far as his case is concerned. Neither the Union nor the workman or any other Union shall take up any dispute of this workman pertaining to this dispute.

5. The parties shall bear their own cost.

6. The parties shall file a copy of this settlement before the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur and pray for an Award in terms of the settlement.

This settlement shall not be treated as precedent.

Representing employers : S. M. Singh.

Representing employee : D. L. Agarwal.

Jabalpur,

Dated : 1-4-1980.

PART OF AWARD

(A. G. Qureshi)

Presiding Officer.

S.O. 1343.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Burhar Sub Area of Western Coalfields Limited, Post Office Amlai, District Shahdol (M.P.) and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 16th April, 1980.

BEFORE SHRI A. G. QURESHI, M.A., LL.B., PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Case No. CGIT/LC(R)(11)/1980

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Burhar Sub-Area of Western Coalfields Limited, Post Office Amlai, District Shahdol and their workmen represented through the General Secretary, Shahdol Zilla Janta Koyala Khan Mazdoor Sangh, Post Office Dhanpuri, District Shahdol (M.P.).

APPEARANCES :

For Union.—Shri D. L. Agarwal.

For Management.—Shri P. S. Nair, Advocate and Shri S. M. Singh, Personnel Manager.

INDUSTRY : Coal

DISTRICT : Shahdol (M.P.)

AWARD

This is a reference made by the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-22012/29/78-D. IV(A) dated 21st February, 1980, for adjudication of the following dispute :—

"Keeping in view the circumstances under which Shri Ram Kumar S/o Shri Jugal Kishore, General Mazdoor, Amlai Colliery was prevented from attending duties with effect from the 13th July, 1975 to 3rd February, 1977, whether the action of the management of Burhar Sub-Area, in denying him back wages for the above period is justified? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled?"

2. Notices were issued to the parties fixing 1-4-1980 for filing their respective statement of claim. On 1-4-1980 the representatives of the parties to the dispute appeared and filed a Memorandum of Settlement containing terms of settlement. The parties have requested the Tribunal that an award be passed in terms of the settlement. Both the representatives of the parties have verified the terms of settlement so arrived at between them.

3. I have gone through the terms of the settlement dated 1-4-1980. The management has agreed to pay 40 per cent of the back wages to Shri Ram Kumar S/o Shri Jugal Kishore for the period from 13th July, 1975 to 3rd February, 1977 on the basis of pay drawn by him at the time of his termination. The Union unconditionally accepted the terms and conditions offered by the management and gave up all their claims for the 60 per cent of the back wages or any other relief from the management. The above terms of settlement appear to be fair, reasonable and beneficial to the workman concerned. As such an award is passed in terms of the settlement incorporated in the Memorandum of Settlement which shall form part of the award.

Dated : 5-4-1980.

A. G. QURESHI, Presiding Officer
[No. I-22012(29)/78-D.IV(A)]

FORM 'H'

(See Rule 58)

For the Memorandum of Settlement

Representing employers.—Shri S. M. Singh, Personnel Manager, Sohagpur Area, Western Coalfields Ltd.

Representing workmen.—Shri D. L. Agarwal, General Secretary, Shahdol Zilla Janta Koyala Khan Mazdoor Sangh.

Short Recital of the Case

1. The General Secretary, Shahdol Zilla a Janta Koyala Khan Mazdoor Sangh took up the question of payment of backwages of Shri Ram Kumar, S/o Jugal Kishore, General Mazdoor, Amlai Colliery for the period from 13th July, 1975 to 3rd February 1977, before the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central), Shahdol. The management appeared before the A.L.C. and submitted that the workman is not entitled to any wages for the period he was not in employment. It was also submitted that the services of the workman came to an automatic end in terms of Clause 17(ii) of the Certified Standing Orders of the Company. Ultimately, the following Reference was referred by the Central Government under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur.

"Keeping in view the circumstances under which Shri Ram Kumar S/o Jugal Kishore, General Mazdoor, Amlai Colliery was prevented from attending duties with effect from the 13th July, 1975 to 3rd February, 1977, whether the action of the management of Burhar Sub-Area, in denying him back wages for the above period is justified? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled?"

2. After the matter was referred the management and the Union had held detailed discussions. Without prejudice to the contention of the management that the Reference is bad in law and the workman is not entitled to any backwages, as a measure of goodwill, the management has agreed to settle the dispute on the following terms :—

Terms of Settlement

- (1) The Management will pay 40 per cent of the backwages for the period from 13th July, 1975 to 3rd February, 1977 to Shri Ram Kumar S/o Jugal Kishore on the basis of pay drawn by him at the time of termination, in full and final settlement of all the claims of the workman.
- (2) The Union unconditionally accept the terms and conditions offered by the management and give up all their claims for the 60 per cent of the backwages or any other relief from the management.
3. The parties submit that on the facts and circumstances of the case, the settlement is fair and reasonable and the workman shall be paid 40 per cent of wages for the period in question even though he did not work during that period.
4. This settlement settles all the dispute between the management and the Union and Shri Ram Kumar, S/o Jugal Kishore as far as his case is concerned. Neither the Union nor the workman or any other Union shall take up any dispute of this workman pertaining to this dispute.
5. The parties shall bear their own cost.
6. The parties shall file a copy of this settlement before the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur and pray for an Award in terms of settlement.

This settlement shall not be treated as precedent.

Jabalpur,

Dated : 1-4-80.

Representing employers : S. M. Singh.

Representing Union : D. L. Agarwal.

PART OF AWARD

(A. G. Qureshi)

PRESIDING OFFICER

New Delhi, the 24th April, 1980

S.O. 1344.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Madras, in the industrial dispute

between the employers in relation to the management of Life Insurance Corporation of India, Trivandrum and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 18th April, 1980.

BEFORE THIRU T. SUDARSANAM DANIEL, B.A., B.L.,
PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
MADRAS

(Constituted by the Government of India)

Monday, the 7th day of April, 1980

Industrial Dispute No. 39 of 1979

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between the workmen and the Management of Life Insurance Corporation of India, Trivandrum).

BETWEEN

The workmen represented by
The General Secretary,
L.I.C. Employees' Union,
P.B. No. 1011, Trivandrum-695004.

AND

The Divisional Manager,
Life Insurance Corporation of India,
Divisional Office, P.B. No. 1001,
Pattom, Trivandrum-695004.

REFERENCE :

Order No. L-17012(14)/79-D.IV(A), dated 14-9-1979 of the Ministry of Labour, Government of India.

This dispute coming on for final hearing on Thursday, the 21st day of February, 1980 upon perusing the reference, claim and counter statements and all other material papers on record and upon hearing the arguments of Thiruvallargal K. R. Chandra Sekharan Pillai and E. R. Ravindran Nair, Executive Committee Members of the Union and of Thiruvallargal C. K. Raghakrishna Pillai, Assistant Divisional Manager (L & M) and A. R. Menon, Assistant Divisional Manager (P & E) appearing for the Management and this dispute having stood over till this day for consideration, this Tribunal made the following.

AWARD

This is an Industrial Dispute between the workmen and the Management of Life Insurance Corporation of India, Trivandrum referred to this Tribunal for adjudication under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 by the Government of India in Order No. L. 17012(14)/79-D.IV(A), dated 14-9-1979 of the Ministry of Labour, in respect of the following issue :

Whether the action of the management of the Life Insurance Corporation of India, Alwaye in demoting Shri K. V. Varghese from the post of Higher Grade Assistant to that of an Assistant with effect from the 7th April, 1977 by way of punishment is justified? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled?

(2) Facts leading upto the dispute are as follows : Respondent-Management is the Divisional Manager, Life Insurance Corporation of India, Divisional Office, P.B. No. 1001, Pattom, Trivandrum-695004, Kerala State. The claim statement has been filed by the General Secretary, L.I.C. Employees' Union, P.B. No. 1011, Trivandrum-695004, Kerala State. The dispute centres round the demotion of Sri K. V. Varghese from the post of Higher Grade Assistant to that of an Assistant passed by the Management of Life Insurance Corporation of India, Alwaye with effect from 7-4-1977. Ex. M-3 is the copy of the memo issued to the employee Shri K. V. Varghese on 5-7-1976 calling for his explanation. Ex. M-4 is the copy of the explanation offered by the employee on the same day 5-7-1976. The Management was not satisfied with the explanation and therefore decided to institute an enquiry. Ex. M-5 is the charge sheet issued to the employee on 20-7-76. Ex. M-6 is the reply sent by the employee on 30-7-1976. Ex. W-25 is the Enquiry Proceedings. Ex. M-12 dated 20th

December, 1976 is the report of the Enquiry Officer. The Enquiry Officer found that the charges levelled against the employee had been substantiated. Accepting the findings of the Enquiry Officer, another show cause letter Ex. M-13 was issued on 12-1-1977 intimating the employee about the proposed penalty of reduction to the lower rank. Ex. M-14 is the proceedings of the Divisional Manager, Trivandrum ordering penalty of reduction to the lower rank. Thereupon the employee submitted an appeal under Regulation 40 of the Life Insurance Corporation of India (Staff) Regulations, 1960 to the Zonal Manager, Life Insurance Corporation of India, South Zone, Madras, the Appellate Authority. [Ex. W-21 is the Life Insurance Corporation of India (Staff) Regulations, 1960]. The Zonal Manager confirmed the order passed by the Divisional Manager, Trivandrum, copy of which is marked as Ex. M-15 dated 3-10-1977. Whereupon the employee presented a Memorial under Regulation 49 before the Chairman, Life Insurance Corporation of India, Central Office, Bombay. The Chairman also rejected this Memorial on 15-6-1973, copy of which is marked as Ex. M-16. Thus it is clear that the disciplinary authority, appellate authority and the Chairman of Life Insurance Corporation of India have concurred in holding that the charges had been proved against the employee. Thereafter, the Union raised the dispute before the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central), Ernakulam. The said Assistant Labour Commissioner also submitted his Conciliation Failure Report Ex. W-18 on 24-5-1979. Subsequently, the Government of India has referred the issue to this Tribunal.

(3) At the commencement, the Respondent-Management contended that the present dispute is only an individual dispute and not an industrial dispute as contemplated under section 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. It is common ground that the destiny of an individual employee, viz., Sri K. V. Varghese is involved in this issue and that too does not relate to his termination, but only to reversion to the lower cadre. No doubt, on a plain reading of the reference it relates only to the individual, viz., Sri K. V. Varghese. But the matters involved in this dispute cover the adverse factors that exist in the conditions of service of the employees. In that view, it can be said that both the employees and the Union have a community of interest in the present dispute. Furthermore, in 1957-1 I.L.J.-Page 27 (Central Provisions Transport Services Ltd., vs. Raghunath Gopal Patwardhan), the Supreme Court has pointed out that the preponderance of judicial opinion is clearly in favour of the view that a dispute between an employer and a single employee cannot per se be an "industrial dispute" within the meaning of Section 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act, but it might become one if it is taken up by the union or a number of workmen. In this context it must be pointed out that the present Union viz., LIC Employees Union alone has initiated the dispute by moving the Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Central), Ernakulam as will be borne out by the Conciliation Failure Report Ex. W-18. Moreover, a copy of the reference itself is marked by the Government of India to the General Secretary, I.L.C. Employees' Union, P.B. No. 1011, Trivandrum-695004 and it is this Union which alone has filed the claim statement as well as Replication Statement also. Significantly, the Management has not taken up any plea that the employee himself has not filed any claim statement as such. Under these circumstances, it is apparent that the cause of Sri K. V. Varghese has been taken up by the Union representing the staff and in that view the present dispute can be considered to be a valid industrial dispute as contemplated under section 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act.

(4) The Life Insurance Corporation of India established under section 3 of the Life Insurance Corporation Act, 1956 is a statutory body entrusted with the general duty of carrying on life insurance business, whether in or outside India. Under Section 49 of the Life Insurance Corporation Act, 1956, the Corporation is entitled to regulate the terms and conditions of service of employees of the Corporation. Accordingly, the Corporation has made regulations known as the Life Insurance Corporation of India (Staff) Regulations, 1960—vide Ex. W-21. It is not disputed that the staff regulations will bind both the Corporation and also its employees. The contention of the Management is that regard being had to the specific provisions relating to disciplinary, appellate or reviewing authority under the Staff Regulations Ex. W-21, this Industrial Tribunal will have no jurisdiction to substitute its own judgment for that of the disciplinary, appellate or reviewing authority especially when it relates only to the demotion of an employee of the Corporation. But in paragraph (5) of the

written statement filed by the Management, it is conceded that this Tribunal will have jurisdiction where principles of natural justice have been violated. In 1958-1 I.L.J.-Page 260 (Indian Iron and Steel Company Ltd., and another vs. their workmen), the Supreme Court has laid down the circumstances in which Industrial Tribunal will interfere with the disciplinary action taken by the employer against the delinquent employee. The Tribunal will interfere in the following circumstances:

- (i) when there is want of good faith;
- (ii) when there is victimisation or unfair labour practice;
- (iii) when the management has been guilty of a basic error or violation of principles of natural justice; and
- (iv) when on the materials, the finding is completely baseless or perverse.

Therefore in the light of the guidelines set out by the Supreme Court, it has to be seen whether any of the four circumstances exist for this Tribunal to have jurisdiction over the findings of the Enquiry Officer. The learned authorised representative for the Union maintains that there are lot of materials and circumstances to show want of good faith on the part of the Management and victimisation of the employee concerned. Put in a nutshell the charge against the employee was that on 3-7-1976, when the Branch Manager was absent from the office and that the employee was directed to take No. 2 key of the office safe in the safe custody on that day the employee left the office at 1.30 P.M. (being Saturday) without taking No. 2 key with him or making any suitable alternate arrangement for keeping of the No. 2 key of the office safe in the safe custody and thereby has displayed utter negligence in discharging the responsible duty assigned to him and the action of the employee was detrimental to the interests of the Corporation.

(5) The case of the employee is that no doubt by about 1.00 P.M. on 3-7-1976 when he was directed to take No. 2 key of the office safe in the safe custody. On that day he had informed the messenger that he is prepared to take No. 2 key at the close of the office hours, viz., 1.30 P.M. (being Saturday) and that at 1.30 P.M. No. 2 key of the office safe in the safe custody was not made ready to him and therefore as he had to go to his house urgently he had left the office at 1.30 P.M. asking the Section Head Sri V. P. Gopinathan Nair to hand over the key to Sri C. P. Joseph who is also entitled to take the key and who was entitled to take the key and who was present in the office at that time. In order to appreciate the disciplinary proceedings which give rise to the present reference initiated against the employee it will be pertinent for me to set out the relationship that existed between the employee and the Management for considerable time even prior to the issue of the charge-memo on 5-7-1976. Ex. W-1 is another charge sheet issued to this employee on 2-1-1976. Under Ex. W-1, the two charges levelled against the employee were that on 8-10-1975, the employee failed to extend proper courtesy to one of the policy holders Sri M. R. Rafudin and the said policy holder was irritated and offended at the behaviour of the employee and secondly in his letter dated 20-11-1975 addressed to the Branch Manager, L.I.C. of India, Branch Office, Alwaye, the employee has employed language lacking in politeness and courtesy towards his superiors. The employee submitted his explanation and apparently the Management was not satisfied with the explanation and the disciplinary proceedings were instituted. This was pending and eventually on 12-10-1976 the Divisional Manager held that the charges had been established against the employee and ordered that the penalty of reduction in basic salary by one stage in the time scale of pay applicable to him and the penalty was to take effect immediately. The employee however did not take down the orders passed by the Management lying down. He had im-

mediately filed Original Petition No. 2219 of 1977-L on the file of the High Court of Kerala at Ernakulam. The Senior Divisional Manager, Trivandrum and the Zonal Manager, Madras respectively were impleaded as Respondents 1 and 2 to that Proceeding. Eventually the High Court has set aside the order passed by the Management.—vide the order of the High Court Ex. W-2 dated 7-1-1980. From the narration of these facts one can easily understand that the relationship between the employee and the Management was far from cordial.

(6) There is also another telling circumstance to indicate that the employee concerned was not treated fairly in the matter of granting of casual leave or other leave to which he is entitled and that he was ceaselessly fighting a never ending battle against the Management to get even the leave he is legitimately entitled to. In paragraph 12 of the counter statement filed by the Management, it is stated that leave applications from employees are dealt with as per the rules and depending upon the office exigencies. Nobody can quarrel with this stand but the point would be whether in the light of the facts disclosed it is possible to conclude that the employee in question has been discriminated against in the matter of grant of leave to which he is legitimately entitled to has been pointed out by the Kerala High Court in Ex. W-2. "What is important is that the delinquent should not have reasons to feel that he was not dealt with fairly and this is the type of impression that should be avoided. The enquiry must not only be fair but should appear to be so." On 17-5-1976, the employee concerned Sri K. V. Varghese submitted an application for 30 days privilege leave from 1-6-1976 to attend to some "domestic affairs". It is true that the employee was granted 26 days' privilege leave from 19-4-1976, whereupon the Management under Ex. W-3 stated that in the interest of the institution the extension of leave applied for cannot be granted. Ex. W-3 further states that the employee may put up with inconvenience until such time when the Management is in a position to grant him leave without jeopardising the interests of office administration. Therefore, after the orders passed by the Management under Ex. W-3, the employee has no other alternative but to pray for any leave. But that does not necessarily follow that the employee was not in need of leave in order to meet his urgent domestic affairs. While so on 28-5-1976, the employee applied for casual leave and on his reporting to office on the next day on 29-5-1976, Ex. W-4 is a letter of the Branch Manager to the employee pointing out that the employee cannot claim leave as a matter of right and absent himself without prior permission. Even from Ex. W-4, it can be gathered that the employee was on leave on 18th, 19th, 20th, 24th, 25th (half a day) and 27th for reasons, viz., illness, urgent domestic and personal affairs. Therefore what the Branch Manager did under Ex. W-4 was to treat the unauthorised absence as extra-ordinary leave without pay. A further direction is also given to the employee to observe the leave rules strictly in future and cause no disturbance to office work. This order of the Branch Manager under Ex. W-4 invokes the reply from the employee on 1-6-1976 under Ex. W-5. In Ex. W-5 the employee has pointed out, how on the morning of 28-5-1976 while attempting to set aright an electric switch in his house he accidentally came into contact with electricity and thrown on to the ground and due to the shock he had to take rest for a few hours and therefore could not attend office on 28-5-1976. The Branch Manager can also observe marks of bruises sustained by him on the right hand and leg as a result of the fall. In Ex. W-5 the employee has further pointed out that it is his 19th year of service with the L.T.C. and his leave record so far had been satisfactory. In Ex. W-5 the employee also called upon the Branch Mana-

ger to supply him with a copy of the Staff Regulations with upto date amendments to enable him to observe strictly the leave and other rules. That request has not been complied with. Again the employee applied for privilege leave for 33 days from 28-6-1976 to 30-7-1976 and the leave applied for has been refused by the Branch Manager on 18-6-1976—vide Ex. W-6. Even after the receipt of the order in Ex. W-6, the employee made another attempt under Ex. M-7 requesting the Branch Manager to reconsider the decision under Ex. W-6 because of his pressing domestic and personal problems remaining unresolved. Again on 9-7-1976, the employee renewed his application for privilege leave for 12-7-1976. That was declined by the Branch Manager on 9-7-1976 under Ex. W-9. The employee again wrote to the Branch Manager on 13-7-1976—vide Ex. M-10, wherein he has pointed out that during the four years from 19-4-1972 to 18-4-1976 he was on leave for only 19 days and out of these, 16 days were used to avail L.T.C. and during the same period, the unused casual leave credited to his converted sick leave account came to 18-1/2 days. Therefore under Ex. W-10 the employee attempted to impress upon the Branch Manager that he seldom takes leave and that when he applies for leave it was out of sheer necessity. However, the Branch Manager seems to have been offended against this so-called unwarranted insinuation contained in Ex. W-10 and therefore under Ex. W-11 he has referred the matter to the Senior Divisional Manager, Trivandrum for his direction to take action against the employee for insubordination. Curiously almost by return of post Senior Divisional Manager, Trivandrum sends his communication Ex. W-12. Normally, the communication from Alwaye to Trivandrum takes one day and such a communication to be answered by the Senior Divisional Manager on the same day is indicative of the extreme concern of the Branch Manager, Alwaye as well as the Senior Divisional Manager in the case of this employee. The Statement of Sri C. P. Joseph, who has been examined as second witness for the Management, marked as Ex. M-11 is dated 19-7-1976. It has been received by the Branch Manager, Alwaye only on that day. Therefore, even if this had been transmitted to the Divisional Manager, Trivandrum it would reach him only on 20-7-1976. But the charge-sheet Ex. M-5 issued by the Senior Divisional Manager, Trivandrum is dated 20-7-1976. Therefore it is apparent that even without receiving the final explanation offered by Sri C. P. Joseph the Management had already decided to issue the charge-sheet to the employee in question. Therefore one cannot fail to note the unhappy relationship that continued to exist between the concerned employee and the Management represented by the Branch Manager and the Senior Divisional Manager at any rate from the middle of May till July, 1976. It should be recalled that when the employee left office on 3-7-1976 his case is that he had to go to attend the urgent domestic work and that it should also be remembered that the employee had worked in the office till 1.30 P.M. (being Saturday). According to the evidence adduced by the Management, the No. 2 key to be entrusted with the employee became available by 1.40 P.M. Admittedly, the employee is not expected to work on Saturday beyond 1.30 P.M. It is not disputed that generally, cash could not be closed immediately after close of office hours and it will normally take half an hour to two hours or more to close the cash due to varying reasons. Therefore when the employee had already intimated that he must due to some personal reasons leave the office immediately at 1.30 P.M. and the possibility is not ruled out that it would take half an hour to two hours or even more to close the cash on any day and that too being the beginning of the month it cannot be said that the employee had committed any grave misconduct by leaving the office at 1.30 P.M. as is entitled to when at that time another C.P. Joseph who is also entitled

to receive the key and who is also residing close-by is available. The important point to be remembered at this juncture is because of extreme difficulty to which the employee is put in the matter of obtaining leave even casually and although he is prepared to go for long leave which has been consistently declined the action of the employee in having left the office by 1.30 P.M. to attend to his urgent domestic work cannot per se be held to be misconduct. However, regard being had to the strained relationship existing between the employee and the Branch Manager, a mountain is sought to be made out of a mole. In the circumstances, the submission of the learned authorised representative for the employee that the action of the Management is anything but in good faith and is only victimisation of the employee appears to be not altogether unfounded.

(7) I shall next deal with the aspect whether the Management has been guilty of any basic error or violation of principles of natural justice. The enquiry commenced on 6th October, 1976, at the Branch Office Headquarters, Alwaye, Ex. W-25 is the enquiry proceedings and Ex. M-12 is the report of the Enquiry Officer. From Ex. M-12, page 3, it can be noted that just prior to the commencement of the enquiry (i.e.) 6.10.1976, the charge-sheeted employee presented two letters dated 4-10-1976 and 6-10-1976 seeking permission to introduce as many as 19 documents. Out of these 19 documents, 14 documents are exhibited on behalf of the workmen before this Tribunal. Out of the six witnesses proposed to be examined by the charge-sheeted employee, four have been examined by him while the Enquiry Officer refused to summon the remaining two witnesses. The only ground on which the Enquiry Officer has declined to issue summons to these two witnesses is that they were not present at the time of the alleged misconduct and could not therefore be credited with first hand personal knowledge of the incidence. I am afraid the domestic enquiry officer has blatantly committed a basic error in holding that any witness to be examined must personally know the incident which forms the basis of the charge. There may be several reasons while a charge-sheeted workman would like to examine those two witnesses, viz., Branch Manager and the Assistant Branch Manager. I have already enumerated in paragraph supra how the relationship between Branch Manager and the employee was deteriorating day by day, to the extent when the Branch Manager even went to the extent of holding that the action of the employee would amount to insubordination.—vide Ex. W-11. Apparently, the Enquiry Officer failed to ascertain from the charge-sheeted employee, the lines on which he expected the evidence from the Branch Manager and the Assistant Branch Manager. Therefore simply refusing to summon those two witnesses merely because they happened to be Branch Manager and the Assistant Branch Manager, the Enquiry Officer has committed a basic error in the procedure. It does not end there. The action of the Enquiry Officer would have certainly created an impression rightly or wrongly in the mind of the charge-sheeted employee that the Enquiry Officer is attempting to shield the officers of the department. Incidentally, it should also be remembered that the Enquiry Officer himself is an officer of the department A.D.M. (KGSD). Furthermore, the Enquiry Officer has refused to admit the documents 1 to 16 sought to be produced by the charge-sheeted employee, on the ground that they are irrelevant in the conduct of the alleged misconduct. Here also the Enquiry Officer has committed the basic error. It was too early for him to conclude that those documents were irrelevant. As a matter of fact, they are now shown to be throwing considerable light on the relationship that existed between the employee and the Branch Manager. Those documents demonstrate the background, atmosphere and conditions under which disciplinary proceedings are initiated against the employee. In that view, I am constrained to find that the Enquiry Officer has committed basic error in declining to summon witnesses desired by the charge-sheeted workman and also declining to admit the documents and the reasonable conclusion is inescapable that he was biased in favour of his own Department against the charge-sheeted employee.

(8) The Enquiry Officer Sri L. Mahadeva Iyer, A.D.M. (KGSD), Divisional Officer, Trivandrum has also committed another basic error. This will be found at page 13 of his report Ex. M-12. It is true that under section 20 and 21 of L.I.C. of India Staff Regulation (Ex. W-21) the whole time of an employee shall be at the disposal of the Corporation and he shall serve the Corporation in its business in such capacity and such place as he may, from time to time be directed unless in any case it be otherwise distinctly provided. But there is no specific section in the Staff Regulation which

enjoins the employee to work outside his office hours. Admittedly, the office hours was over by 1.30 P.M. on 3-7-1976 as it happened to be Saturday-holiday. By the phrase "the whole time" of an employee shall be at the disposal of the Corporation, it does not necessarily follow that for all the 24 hours of the day the employee must be at the back and call of the employer to do any work that he may ask him to carry out. I have already pointed out how normally it would take half an hour to two hours or even more to close the cash due to varying reasons. Therefore resort cannot be had under section 20 and 21 of the Staff Regulation making it incumbent on the employee to do the work even after the scheduled hours. Hence by committing this basic error, the Enquiry Officer who is himself as an employee of the Bank appears to be more loyal than the King himself. In any view, the hard fact remains that he has committed a basic error in his approach to the facts placed.

(9) Originally, the date of enquiry was fixed as 17th September, 1976. This was intimated to the charge-sheeted employee by registered letter dated 7-9-1976. On 8-9-1976, the employee furnished the name and address of his helper Sri K. R. Chandrasekharan Pillai, Assistant, L.I.C. of India, Divisional Office, Trivandrum. However, by his letter dated 14-9-1976, the aforesaid helper expressed his inability to be present at Alwaye on 17-9-1976 on account of the sudden illness of his child. But the Enquiry Officer by his letter dated 15-9-1976, has refused to postpone the enquiry and informed both the charge-sheeted employee and the helper that the enquiry would be conducted as originally scheduled. In the circumstances, the refusal of the Enquiry Officer even to give a short accommodation has naturally thrown good deal of apprehension in the mind of the employee that the Enquiry Officer is not inclined to consider the request on merits. On 17-9-1976, even without the assistance of helper the enquiry commenced at 10.30 A.M. and the charge was read out to the charge-sheeted employee and he denied the same. True copies of the exhibits given to the charge-sheeted employee were allowed to be verified with the originals and on a further plea by the charge-sheeted employee for lack of assistance of his helper, the enquiry was adjourned to 6.10.1976. In any way, the hard fact remains that reasonable apprehension against the enquiry officer that he is not inclined to consider the claims on merits has been created in the mind of the charge-sheeted employee. This fact in addition to the refusal of Enquiry Officer at the next hearing date to examine witnesses desired by the charge-sheeted workman and to admit the documents produced by him had created the impression that the Enquiry Officer who is an employee of the Management will not be impartial in his assessment and approach to the facts presented before him. Another crucial basic error appearing in the proceedings is that while opportunity is given to the charge-sheeted employee to have the assistance of helper in the conduct of the enquiry proceedings he has not been given any chance whatsoever either to offer his arguments by himself or helper orally or in writing before the disciplinary authority, viz., the Divisional Manager, Trivandrum. It must be remembered that it is an invaluable right for any charge-sheeted workman to offer his arguments before the disciplinary authority. Admittedly, no opportunity has been afforded to the charge-sheeted workman to address his arguments on the report submitted by the Enquiry Officer to the disciplinary authority. In that view, it must be held that the procedure of the disciplinary authority acting on the report of the Enquiry Officer without giving a hearing of the employee or hearing a representation from the charge-sheeted workman or his helper is plainly violative of principles of natural justice.

(10) In paragraph 10 of the claim statement, the Union states that the Divisional Manager Sri D. R. Iyer who was prejudiced against the employee Sri K. V. Varghese had collected evidence and collected the same behind the back of employee. In other words, the case of the employee is that the Divisional Manager in collaboration with the Branch Manager had created a show of evidence against the charge-sheeted employee and the obdient Enquiry Officer had obligingly swallowed those materials against the charge-sheeted employee. From the undisputed evidence and the documents, it is clear that three official records, viz., (1) the Daily Cash Book, (2) Movement Register of Key No. 1 and (3) Movement Register of Key No. 2 were corrected. Before the corrections, the endorsement by the Section Head Sri V. P. Gopinathan Nair who has been examined as first witness for the Management was that all the persons who are entitled to hold Key No. 2 as per order Ex. M-2 were not available. But subsequently, the corrections are made to the effect that Sri

K. V. Varghese refused to receive Key No. 2. The first witness Sri V. P. Gopinathan Nair, the Section Head has explained the corrections. His original verification would clearly indicate that more than one person who is entitled to receive Key No. 2 was available. That would demonstrate that at that time, both Sri K. V. Varghese and Sri C. P. Joseph, who has been examined as 2nd witness were available. The Section Head has stated that Key No. 2 was available only at 1.40 P.M. Therefore, from these documentary materials, there is intrinsic evidence to hold that apart from Sri K. V. Varghese, Sri C. P. Joseph who is also entitled to receive Key No. 2 was available. If the records had stood as they were, certainly the liability on Sri C. P. Joseph alone could not be fixed and therefore it is not improbable that subsequently the corrections had been made to eliminate the presence of Sri C. P. Joseph. At page 12 of the enquiry report (Ex. M-12) the Enquiry Officer points out that the Presenting Officer (on behalf of the Management) points out that "the corrections in the 'D.C.B. Remarks' and 'Key Movement Register' are only minor matters if not even secondary importance and unconnected with the charges and they are only incidental to the remarks taken in the hurry of business." This is the cavalry fashion in which the Presenting Officer has made his submission and the Enquiry Officer has his own views on these matters as seen from page 13 where he says "I also feel convinced that the corrections in the 'D.C.B. remarks' and 'Key Movement Register' are only incidental to the remarks taken in the hurry of business, at the close of office hours and they have no bearing on the charges in question." Thus both the Presenting Officer as well as Enquiry Officer have missed the real point in the corrections made by the Section Head. In this context, there is the evidence offered by the employee that Sri C. P. Joseph was available at 1.40 P.M. when Key No. 2 was made available. Dealing with this evidence, at page 11 of the findings Ex. M-12, the Enquiry Officer states "I consider that it is of secondary importance whether Sri C. P. Joseph (P.W. 2) was still in the office or not when the charge sheeted employee left the office." Thus the Enquiry Officer has totally failed to understand the weight of the evidence produced by the employee that although he had left the office at 1.30 P.M. Sri C. P. Joseph (P.W. 2) was available at the office at 1.40 P.M. when alone Key No. 2 was ready to be handed over. In the light of these materials it is abundantly clear that originally when the certificate was made by the Section Head it was to the effect that persons were not available for handing over Key No. 2 and subsequently this has been altered to eliminate others and to fix a liability on Sri K. V. Varghese alone. To this manipulation, the Enquiry Officer has also subscribed his seal by refusing to read the plain writing on the wall. In this context, I should also point out that on 3-7-1976 when the incident had taken place, the Section Head had not given any report in writing. P.W. 1 is the Section Head for 12 years and 5 months and has admitted that he had applied for the Superintendent post. Hence he is beholden to the Branch Manager and the Divisional Manager for his promotion. During the Enquiry, it was sought to be elicited from him whether on earlier occasions he had carried both Key No. 1 and 2 on any day. Curiously, this was objected to by the Presenting Officer and also the Enquiry Officer faithfully upheld the objection. Even at that stage the helmer for the employee has pointed out that it is a direct violation of principles of natural justice and the employee has also doubt about the partiality of the Enquiry Officer. The Section Head has also admitted that even though he carried two keys on 3-7-1976 there was no untoward incident and that the cash was secure. Therefore it is not improbable that although two keys should not normally remain with the same person there may be exceptional cases when this is possible without causing any damage to the Institution. However, the Management was anxious to take advantage of a situation which arose on 3-7-1976.

(11) Ex. M-3 is the Note sent by the Branch Manager to the employee on 5-7-1976. No doubt Ex. M-3 states that the Branch Manager has learned from Section Head Sri V. P. Gopinathan Nair that Sri K. V. Varghese refused to carry one of the keys of the office on Saturday. But significantly the Note Ex. M-3 does not whisper that the Section Head had given any report in writing. On the other hand, immediately on receipt of the original of Ex. M-3, the employee has written on 5-7-1976 under the original of Ex. M-4 to the effect that the Cash and D.C.B. were not ready at 1.30 P.M. for safe custody and signature and therefore he had to leave the office requesting the Section Head to entrust the key

with Sri C. P. Joseph, who was also authorised to carry keys of the safe and Sri C. P. Joseph was in the office when he left. After the receipt of the explanation Ex. M-4, the Branch Manager has brought into existence Ex. M-8 as well as Ex. M-7. Therefore, it is apparent that in order to fasten the liability on Sri K. V. Varghese, Exs. M-7 and M-8 had been brought into existence by the Branch Manager with the assistance of the Section Head and also Sri A. M. Basheer who is a temporary sub-staff and who is also beholden to the Branch Manager for making permanent and to get a transfer to his native place. While so, after some time the Management wanted to charge Sri C. P. Joseph also as having been guilty of not taking Key No. 2 on 3-7-1976. If as the Management would have it that on 3-7-1976, the specific directions was that Sri K. V. Varghese alone should take the Key No. 2 and nobody else was expected to take the key and that Sri C. P. Joseph was not available it really remains a mystery how long after Sri K. V. Varghese has submitted his explanation, on 16-7-1976 Ex. M-9 was issued to Sri C. P. Joseph accusing him of not taking Key No. 2 of the office cash safe on 3-7-1976. Thus it is clear that even on 16-7-1976, the Management looked also to Sri C. P. Joseph as a person who could have taken Key No. 2 on 3-7-1976. The issue of Ex. M-9 would also strengthen the case of the employee that Sri C. P. Joseph was available at about 1.40 P.M. when the key was made ready and the explanation of Sri C. P. Joseph under Ex. M-10 dated 17-7-1976 is clear that he had left the office at 1.30 P.M. and he had no direction to collect the office safe key No. 2 on that day. Apparently, the Management was not satisfied with the explanation of Sri C. P. Joseph under Ex. M-10, because he does not specifically mention that Sri K. V. Varghese alone has to take the key on 3-7-1976. After Sri C. P. Joseph had given the explanation under Ex. M-10 on 17-7-1976 the Branch Manager had again called on Sri Joseph to give a detailed explanation from Ex. M-11 it can be seen that this was on 17-7-1976. Therefore the issue of two letters Ex. M-9 and another Ex. W-22 on the next day dated 17-7-1976 would clearly indicate the anxiety on the part of the Branch Manager to wrest this complaint against Sri K. V. Varghese. From these facts it is reasonable to infer that the corrections found in D.C.B. Remarks and Key Movement Register must have been made only after the second explanation given by Sri C. P. Joseph Ex. M-11 on 19-7-1976. The Section Head has readily obliged by making corrections in order to show that Sri K. V. Varghese alone is responsible to take the key on 3-7-1976. A further point which the Manager wanted and which was obliged by Sri C. P. Joseph in Ex. M-11 was that when he left the office at 1.30 P.M. Sri K. V. Varghese was present in the office. Therefore there is good deal of force in the submission of authorised representative for Union that even on 17-7-1976, the Branch Manager had prevailed on Sri C. P. Joseph who is likely to be charge-sheeted for failing to take Key No. 2 on 3-7-1976 has decided to give some support to the Branch Manager. Sri C. P. Joseph has also applied for being promoted in rank of an officer. Therefore he has to naturally depend on the Management for his immediate future. Hence, it is manifest that even by about 19-7-1976, it was not clear that Sri K. V. Varghese was alone to be taken the task for having taken the key on 3-7-1976. While so the charge sheet is dated 29-7-1976 by the Senior Divisional Manager, Trivandrum which will show the speed with which the Branch Manager has acted to bring the charge against the employee. Witnesses may lie, but circumstances do not. These surrounding and attendant circumstances clearly point out that the Branch Manager has in league with the Section Head and Sri C. P. Joseph have brought about several documents and several materials and in happy company with the Divisional Manager had caused the charge-sheet to be issued to the charge-sheeted employee. On an anxious and careful consideration of the entire evidence, I am constrained to conclude that the charge-sheeted employee has been victimised by the department.

(12) In the result, an Award is passed holding that the action of the Management in demoting Sri K. V. Varghese from the post of Higher Grade Assistant to that of an Assistant with effect from 7th April, 1977 is unjustified and illegal. The result would be that Sri K. V. Varghese must be deemed to have continued in service with all rights and privileges as if no such order of demotion had taken place. As the employee has been driven from pillar to post to vindicate his right by the Management, I direct the Management to pay

Rs. 200 as cost to the Petitioner—Union which is espousing the cause of Sri K. V. Varghese.
Dated, this 7th day of April, 1980

T. SUDARSANAM, DANIEL, Presiding Officer
[No. L-17012(14)/79-D.IV (A)]

NAND LAL, Desk Officer

WITNESS EXAMINED

For both sides : None

DOCUMENTS MARKED

For workmen :

- Ex. W-1/2-1-76—Charge sheet issued to the employee.
- Ex. W-2/7-1-80—Judgment in O.P. No. 2219/77-L of the Kerala High Court (Certified copy).
- Ex. W-3/18-5-76—Letter from the Management to the employee regarding privilege leave.
- Ex. W-4/29-5-76—Letter from the Branch Manager of L.I.C. to the employee regarding casual leave application for 28-5-76.
- Ex. W-5/1-6-76—Letter from the employee, in reply to Ex.-4.
- Ex. W-6/18-6-76—Letter from the Branch Manager, L.I.C. to the employee regarding Privilege Leave application for 33 days from 26-6-76 to 30-7-76.
- Ex. W-7/18-6-76—Reply letter from the employee to Ex. W-6.
- Ex. W-8/9-7-76—Letter from the employee to the Branch Manager, L.I.C. for grant of privilege leave from 12-7-1976.
- Ex. W-9/9-7-76—Letter from the Branch Manager, L.I.C. to the employee regarding privilege leave.
- Ex. W-10/13-7-76—Letter from the employee to the Branch Manager, L.I.C. regarding privilege leave.
- Ex. W-11/15-7-76—Letter from the Branch Manager, L.I.C. to the employee regarding privilege leave.
- Ex. W-12/16-7-76—Letter from the Senior Divisional Manager, L.I.C. to the employee regarding privilege leave.
- Ex. W-13/5-7-76—Letter from the Branch Manager to the employee calling explanation for his refusal to carry office cash safe key.
- Ex. W-14/6-7-76—Reply of the employee to Ex. W-13.
- Ex. W-15/6-7-76—Letter from the Branch Manager, L.I.C. to the employee regarding not carrying No. II key.
- Ex. W-16/6-7-76—Letter from the employee to the Branch Manager, L.I.C. in reply to Ex. W-15.
- Ex. W-17/23-4-79—Letter from the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C), Ernakulam to the Union.
- Ex. W-18/24-5-79—Conciliation failure report.
- Ex. W-19/15-9-76—Letter from the Enquiry Officer to the helper of the employee regarding postponement of enquiry.
- Ex. W-20/14-3-78—Memorial submitted to the Chairman of L.I.C. by the employee.
- Ex. W-21—(Staff) Regulations, 1960 of L.I.C.
- Ex. W-22/17-7-76—Letter from the Branch Manager to Thiru C.P. Joseph regarding No. II Key.
- Ex. W-23—Reply of the employee to the Show cause notice proposing the penalty of reduction to lower post.
- Ex. 24/5-7-77—Appeal of the employee before the Zonal Manager of the L.I.C. Madras.

Ex. W-25/5-7-77—Enquiry Proceedings.

For Management

- Ex. M-1/3-4-71—Circular of the Central Office regarding checking of cash and keeping of safe keys. (copy)
- Ex. M-2/4-11-71—Office order of the Branch Office, Always regarding checking of cash and keeping of safe keys. (copy).
- Ex. M-3/5-7-76—Memo issued to the employee calling for explanation for refusing to carry the office cash safe key. (copy).
- Ex. M-4/5-7-76—Explanation of the employee to Ex. M-3. (copy).
- Ex. M-5/20-7-76—Charge sheet issued to the employee.
- Ex. M-6/30-7-76—Reply of the employee to Ex. M-5.
- Ex. M-7/5-7-76—Statement of Thiru A. M. Basheer in Malayalam.
- Ex. M-8/5-7-76—Report of Thiru V. P. Gopinathan Nair, Section Head against the employee Thiru Varghese.
- Ex. M-9/16-7-76—Memo issued to Thiru C. P. Joseph.
- Ex. M-10/17-7-76—Reply of Thiru C. P. Joseph to Ex. M-9.
- Ex. M-11/19-7-76—Letter from Thiru C. P. Joseph to the Branch Manager, L.I.C., Always regarding non-taking of Key No. II.
- Ex. M-12/20-12-76—Report of the Enquiry Officer.
- Ex. M-13/12-1-77—Show cause letter issued to the employee proposing the penalty of reduction to the lower post.
- Ex. M-14/7-4-77—Proceedings of the Divisional Manager ordering penalty of reduction to the lower post.
- Ex. M-15/3-10-77—Order of the Zonal Manager, confirming the order passed in Ex. M-14.
- Ex. M-16/15-6-78—Order of the Chairman of the L.I.C. rejecting the memorial submitted by the employee.

T. SUDARSANAM DANIEL,
Industrial Tribunal

Note : Parties are directed to take return of their document/s within six months from the date of the Award.

नई दिल्ली, 24 अप्रैल, 1980

का० आ० 1343.—यह केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि बि. मद्रास मोटर एक्सेसरीज एजेंसी 287/290, पार्सफोस्टम रोड मद्रास-14, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों को बहु-संख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उस स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए.

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 अप्रैल, 1972 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।
[सं. एम०-35019(86)/79-पी० एफ०-2(i)]

New Delhi, the 24th April, 1980

S.O. 1345.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs. The Madras Motor Accessories Agency, 287/290, Pycrofts Road, Madras-14 have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of April, 1972.

[No. S. 35019/86/79-PF. II(ii)]

का० भा० 1346.—केन्द्रीय सरकार कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 6 के प्रथम परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, सम्बन्ध विषय में आवश्यक आच करने के पश्चात् 1 अप्रैल, 1972 से मैसेर्स दि मद्रास मोटर एक्सेसरीज एजेंसी, 287/290, पाईफोर्टस् रोड, मद्रास-14, नाम स्थापन को उक्त परन्तुक के प्रयोजनों के लिए विनिर्दिष्ट करती है।

[सं० एम-35019/86/79-पी० एफ-2 (ii)]

S.O. 1346.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the first proviso to section 6 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government, after making necessary enquiry into the matter, hereby specifies with effect from the first day of April, 1972 the establishment known as Messrs. The Madras Motor Accessories Agency, 287/290, Pycrofts Road, Madras-14, for the purposes of the said proviso.

[No. S. 35019/86/79-PF. II(ii)]

का० भा० 1347.—अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि जैन शिपिंग एंड शिप बिल्डर्स (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड, वास्को-डा-गामा, जिसके अन्तर्गत (1) स्टाफ आफिस, (2) रियर्स डबोलिम और (3) बार्गेनिस रिवर फ्लीट डिपार्टमेंट, जिनमें उसकी शाखाएँ भी हैं, नामक स्थापन से सम्बन्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 30 जून, 1973 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एम-35018/70/79-पी० एफ-2]

S.O. 1347.—Whereas it appears of the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs. Jain Shipping and Ship Builders (Private) Limited, Vasco-da-Gama including its branches (1) Staff Office, (2) Repairs Dabolim and (3) Barge-cris River Fleet Department, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the thirtieth day of June, 1973.

[No. S. 35018/70/79-PF.II]

का० भा० 1348.—अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि सारदा सर्विसेज कॉर्पोरेशन 1/155, माउंट रोड, मद्रास-2, नामक स्थापन से सम्बन्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

85 GI/80—8

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 नवम्बर, 1976 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एम० 35019/260/79-पी० एफ-2]

S.O. 1348.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs. Sarada Services Corporation, 1/155, Mount Road, Madras-2, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of November, 1976.

[No. S. 35019/60/79-PF.II]

नई दिल्ली, 26 अप्रैल, 1980

का० भा० 1349.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसेर्स गिरिसन्स, 31/ए-3, माउंट रोड, मद्रास-32, नामक स्थापन से सम्बन्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

यह अधिसूचना 1 फरवरी, 1979 को प्रवृत्त हुई समझी जाएगी।

[सं० एम-35019/254/79-पी० एफ-2]

हंस राज छाबड़ा, उप सचिव

New Delhi, the 26th April, 1980

S.O. 1349.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs. Girisans, 31/A-3, Mount Road, Madras-32, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of February, 1979.

[No. S. 35019/254/79-PF.II]

HANS RAJ, CHHABRA, Dy. Secy.

New Delhi, the 29th April, 1980

S.O. 1350.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Dhanbad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Mosaboni Mines of Indian Copper Complex of M/s. Hindustan Copper Limited and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 17th April, 1980.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

Reference No. 47 of 1979

In the matter of an industrial dispute under S. 10(1)(d)
of the I.D. Act, 1947.

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of Mosaboni
Mines of Indian Copper Complex of Messrs. Hindus-
tan Copper Limited.

AND

Their workmen.

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the employers—(1) Shri A. K. Sarkar, Ad-
vocate. (2) Shri S. N. Mishra, Law Officer.

On behalf of the workmen—Shri A. K. Mishra, General
Secretary, Mosaboni Mines Labour Union.

STATE: Bihar.

INDUSTRY: Copper.

Camp: Jamshedpur.

12th April, 1980.

AWARD

This is a reference under S. 10 of the I.D. Act, 1947.
The Central Government by its notification No. L-29011/21/
75-D.O.3(B)/D.IV(B) dated 31st December, 1975 referred this
case to Tribunal No. 3 for adjudication on the following
terms:

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Mosaboni
Mines of Indian Copper Complex of Messrs Hindus-
tan Copper Limited, Post Office Mosaboni Mines,
District Singhbhum in dismissing Sarvashri Dirjama
Neor, Gulab Shukla, Janakdhari Singh, Raj Narain
Singh, Padam Bahadur and Chandreshwar Prasad
was justified? If not, to what relief are the con-
cerned workmen entitled?"

These concerned workmen were dismissed for absenting for
more than 10 days and thereby violating Clause 9(viii) of
the certified standing order which amounts to misconduct.
In fact due to continued absence of these workmen the
management treated their case to be abandonment of service.
An industrial dispute was raised on their behalf by Shri R. K.
Nair, General Secretary, Mosaboni Mines Labour Union. This
has led to this reference.

On behalf of the workmen it was contended that the dis-
charge order of the workmen was simply a preliminary ex-
cuse to cover up the prejudice of the management on account
of the union activities of these workmen. The management on
the other hand, alleged that the continued absence of the
workmen was on account of certain criminal case pending
against them in which they were trying to evade arrest.

This is a very old case and both the parties on the one
ground or the other have been taking time. The case was
originally referred to the Central Government Industrial Tri-
bunal (No. 3) Dhanbad. This court received it on transfer
on 7-7-1979 and thereafter a serious attempt was made to
see that the case was disposed of at an early date. Ultimately,
it has ended in settlement between the parties on the basis
of which an award is prayed to be passed.

Under the terms of the settlement the concerned workmen
are to be employed afresh. It means that their past services will
not be counted. But they will be entitled to the subsequent
revision of pay and all the other monetary benefits available
to a workman. I have considered the settlement very minutely
and I feel that under the circumstances of the case it will
be beneficial to the workmen. I, have therefore no hesitation
in accepting the terms and conditions as incorporated in the
settlement as a final settlement of their dispute arising in this
reference.

This is my award and the settlement will form part of this
award.

J. P. SINGH, Presiding Officer

BEFORE THE HON'BLE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2, DHANBAD

Ref: I.D. Reference Case No. 1/76

BETWEEN

M/s. Gulab Shukla, Janakdhari Singh, Raj Narayan
Singh & Chandreshwar Prasad represented by Mos-
aboni Mines Labour Union, P.O. Mosaboni, Distt.
Singhbhum, Bihar.

AND

Indian Copper Complex, Hindustan Copper Limited P.O.
Ghatsila, Distt. Singhbhum, Bihar.

The parties to the above industrial dispute respectfully sub-
mit as follows:—

1. That the above Industrial Dispute has been pending before
the Hon'ble Tribunal with regard to the dismissal of M/s.
Gulab Shukla, Ex Badge No. 3879, Mate—II, Janakdhari
Singh, Ex Badge No. 8983, Traming Mazdoor, Raj Narayan
Singh, Ex Badge No. 7500, Sepoy and Chandreshwar Prasad,
Ex Badge No. 4504, Blaster (hereinafter called the said work-
men).

2. It is agreed that the Management of Indian Copper Com-
plex, Hindustan Copper Limited will give fresh employment
to the said workmen. The letter of fresh employment will be
issued by the Management within 15 days from the date,
an Award, in terms of this Settlement, is made by the Hon'ble
Tribunal.

3. On fresh employment, the said workmen will be given
the pay, the scale of pay and the post as shown in Annexure-
'A'.

4. It is agreed that on fresh employment the said workmen
will be governed by the Standing Orders as applicable in all
matters relating to their conditions of service as provided
therein.

5. It is agreed that in case the said workmen have to pay
any dues to the Company towards house rent, electricity
charges etc. or towards any advance availed by them in the
past, such dues will be recovered from them in suitable
monthly instalments.

6. Considering the fact that the said workmen have been
out of employment for over five years, it is agreed that no
departmental action will be taken against them for alleged
acts of misconduct, committed by them during their earlier
spell of employment in the Company. However, any act of
misconduct which may be committed by the said workmen
shall viewed seriously and past record of their service in the
Company will not be ignored while deciding punishment. This
Settlement will also not effect criminal cases pending against
the said workmen.

7. It is agreed that apart from the benefits granted herein, no
other benefits for the past service will be claimed in respect
of the said workmen.

8. The said workmen assure that discipline and orderly con-
duct will be maintained by them and no recourse will be made
to violence, intimation or any unlawful methods or activities.

9. It is agreed that the Industrial Dispute in this reference
before the Hon'ble Tribunal has been fully and finally re-
solved on the above terms.

10. The parties pray that the Hon'ble Tribunal may be pleased to accept the above settlement and give an Award in terms of this Settlement.

Signed on 9th day of April, 1980 at Dhanbad.

For MOSABONI MINES LABOUR UNION

Sd/-

(A. K. MISHRA)

General Secretary

For INDIAN COPPER COMPLEX
HINDUSTAN COPPER LTD.

Sd/-

(K. K. VIDYARTHI)

Chief Personnel Manager

SEAI

Presiding Officer,

Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2)

DHANBAD

Statement showing particulars of certain Dismissed workmen of Mosaboni Mines.

Sl. No.	Name & B. No.	Date of entry into service of ICC	Date of dismissal	Designation and Grade on the date of the dismissal	Basic pay on the date of dismissal	Scale of pay on the date of dismissal
1.	Shri Janakdhari Singh B/No.8983	3-4-71 as mucker	4-10-74	Timber Mazd. CM-IV	Rs. 162	150-6-210
2.	Sri Gulab Shukla B/No. 3879	1-6-67 Mining Appr. 1-6-69 as Blaster Hr.	7-10-74	Mate II (MR-VIII)	334	295-13-503
3.	Sri Chandreswar Prasad, B/No. 4504 Surda	4-9-63 as Comps Blaster	4-10-74	Comp. Blaster (CM-9)	245	215-10-355
4.	Sri Raj Narayan Singh	10-9-51 as Sepoy	3-10-74	Sepoy (SMR-2)	167	143-4-179

Revised position of basic pay & scale of pay after conciliation settlement dt 31-1-76 effective from 1-9-75.		Position after job evolution effective from 31-8-79 corresponding scale of pay (pre-revised)	Revised position effective from 1-9-79		
Basic Pay	Scale of Pay		Revised designation	Revised scale of pay	Revised Basic pay to be fixed
Rs. 206	190-8-270	230-11-362 (S-3)	Timber Mistry Asstt. I	415-13-610	Rs. 415
383	335-16-575	390-20-490-25-715 (HS I)	Jr. Tech. Supervisor	655-35-1075	655
294	255-13-411	310-16-550 (HS-3)	Blaster I	525-20-605-25-830	525
208	183-5-243	205-7-296 (S-4)	Sepoy	385-11-550	385

[No. L-29011/21/75-D.III.B]

New Delhi, the 3rd May, 1980

S.O. 1351.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Madras in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of India Cements Limited, Sankari West, Salem District and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 11th April, 1980.

BEFORE THIRU T. SUDARSANAM DANIEL, B.A., B.L.,
PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
MADRAS

(Constituted by the Government of India)

Tuesday, the 1st day of April, 1980

Industrial Dispute No. 12 of 1980

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under Section 10(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between the workmen and the Management of M/s. India Cements Limited, Sankari West Salem District).

BETWEEN

The workman represented by the Presidents :—

1. Sankari India Cement Employees Union, C/o India Cements Limited, Sankari West, Salem District.
2. Sankari Cement Alai Thezhilalar Munnetra Sangam, C/o The India Cements Limited, Sankari West P.O., Salem District.
3. Sankari India Cement Workers Union, C/o The India Cements Limited, Sankari West P.O. Salem District.

AND

The General Manager,
India Cements Limited, Sankari West,
Salem District.

REFERENCE :

Order No. L-29025/57/79-D.III.B., dated 11th February, 1980 of the Ministry of Labour, Government of India.

This dispute coming on this day for final hearing upon perusing the reference and all other material papers on

record and upon hearing of Thiru S. Jayaraman, Advocate appearing for the Management and Thiruvalargal K. Doraisami, T. Munirathna Naidu and K. Ramakrishnan, Advocates for Union No. 2 having reported no instructions and Union Nos. 1 and 3 being absent and the counsel for Management having filed memorandum that the matter in dispute has already been decided in I.D. No. 14 of 1979 and recording the same, this Tribunal made the following Award.

AWARD

This is an Industrial Dispute between the workmen and the Management of Messrs. India Cements Limited, Sankari West, Salem District referred to this Tribunal for adjudication under Section 10(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 by the Government of India in Order No. L-29025[57] 79-D.III.B, dated 11-2-1980 of the Ministry of Labour, in respect of the following issue :

Whether a higher quantum of bonus than the minimum of 8.33 per cent declared by the management is payable to the workmen for the accounting year 1977-78 and if so, to fix the quantum.

(2) Facts leading upto the reference are as follows : The Respondent is the Management of the India Cements Limited, Sankari West, Salem District, Tamil Nadu. The workmen of the Respondent Management are represented by three Unions, viz., Sankari India Cements Employees Union, Sankari Cement Alai Thozhilalar Munnetra Sangam and Sankari India Cements Workers Union. With regard to the quantum of bonus payable for the accounting year 1977-78, all the three Unions and the Management entered into a settlement on 4-11-1978 wherein they had agreed to make a joint application under Section 10(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for the reference to the Industrial Tribunal, Madras. That application was sent both to the Government of Tamil Nadu and to the Government of India, because both the workmen of the India Cements Limited for which the appropriate Government is Government of Tamil Nadu and the workmen of the quarry for which the appropriate Government is the Government of India. On the basis of this aforesaid joint application, the Government of Tamil Nadu in G.O. Ms. No. 306, Labour and Employment Department, dated 22-2-1979 made a reference to this Tribunal on the dispute between the Unions and the Management. The said reference was taken on the file of this Tribunal as I.D. No. 14 of 1979 and an Award was passed on 1-2-1980 declaring that the workmen are entitled to only 8.33 per cent (i.e.) minimum bonus under the Bonus Act. It cannot be disputed that what applies to the workmen of the India Cements Limited would naturally apply to the workmen of the quarry. Unfortunately, the present reference by the Government of India was made only on 11-2-1980 and the same has been taken on the file of this Tribunal as I.D. No. 12 of 1980. Hence the Award passed in I.D. No. 14 of 1979 would be binding on all the parties although present reference specifically related to the workman in the quarry. It should be recalled that the Award in I.D. No. 14 of 1979 had been passed by this Tribunal after permitting all the parties to adduce evidence both oral and documentary. In the circumstances, a joint memo was sought to be filed to the effect that a similar award may also be passed in this present industrial dispute. However, Union No. 3 remained absent even on 5-3-1980. Even then the Management thought that the Unions might see the desirability of passing an award similar to the one passed in I.D. No. 14 of 1979 by this Tribunal. Twice time had been granted to enable the Unions to subscribe to the joint memo. However, eventually counsel for Union No. 2 represented to this Tribunal that he has no instruction from his Union and Union No. 1 also remains absent. One can understand the unwillingness on the part of the union leaders to agree to the joint memo. But the hard fact remains that in the circumstances, an award similar to the one passed in I.D. No. 14 of 1979 alone had to be passed in this Industrial Dispute also. In this context it might be borne in mind that summons had been issued to all the three Unions even on 18-2-1980 for appearing and filing of claim statements by 5-3-1980. Unions 2 and 3 were served on 21-2-1980 while Union No. 1 was served on 23-2-1980. When the matter was taken up by this Tribunal on 5-3-1980, Union No. 3 remained absent and did not even send any claim statement as such by post. Likewise Union Nos. 2 and 3 had not filed any claim statement as far as the present reference is concerned. I may also point out that learned counsel representing Union No. 2 while

saying that he has no instruction from his Union did not even whisper that the Award in I.D. No. 14 of 1979 of this Tribunal is being challenged by his Union or any other Union. In any view, the ultimate result of the award in I.D. No. 14 of 1979 would be the only guide for passing an award in this Industrial Dispute which relates to the workmen of the Respondent-Management employed in quarry, viz., mines which specifically come within the jurisdiction of the Government of India. Therefore, on par with the Award passed in I.D. No. 14 of 1979 by this Tribunal, an Award will be passed in this Industrial Dispute holding that the employees of the Respondent-Management would only be entitled to statutory minimum bonus of 8.33 per cent of the wages during 1977-78.

(3) In the result, an Award is passed holding that the employees of the Respondent-Management are entitled to statutory minimum bonus of 8.33 per cent of the wages during 1977-78. No costs.

Dated, this 1st day of April, 1980.

T. SUDARSANAM DANIEL,
Industrial Tribunal

ANNEXURE

Memo Filed by the Respondent

It is submitted that the above mentioned petitioner Unions and Respondent Management entered into a settlement dated 4-11-1978 wherein they have agreed to make a joint application under Section 10(2) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for the reference of the dispute regarding the quantum of bonus payable for the accounting year 1977-78 to the Industrial Tribunal, Madras.

2. The application was sent both to the Government of Tamil Nadu and to the Government of India because both the workmen of the India Cements Limited, for which the appropriate government is Government of Tamil Nadu and the workmen of the quarry for which the appropriate Government is the Government of India are involved in this case.

3. The Government of Tamil Nadu made a reference to the Industrial Tribunal of the industrial dispute between the above mentioned parties. The above dispute was numbered as I.D. 14 of 1979. An Award dated 1-2-1980 was passed in the said I.D. 14 of 1979 wherein the Tribunal has passed an award declaring that the workmen are entitled only to 8.33 per cent, i.e., minimum bonus as per the Act.

4. It is submitted that the same will be applicable to the workmen in the quarry also. The reference was made by the Central Government only on 11-2-1980 and the I.D. is numbered as I.D. 12 of 1980. The matter has already been decided and an award has already been passed on 1-2-1980 in I.D. 14 of 1979. The aforesaid award will be binding on the workmen in the quarry also. It is submitted that the evidence let in both oral and documentary in I.D. 14 of 1979 may be treated as evidence in this I.D. 12 of 1980 and an award may be passed as in I.D. 14 of 1979.

5. Hence it is prayed that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to pass suitable orders in terms of this joint memo filed by the parties herein.

Dated at Madras this 19th day of March, 1980.

For the India Cements Limited.

(Sd).....

(Secretary)

(Respondent)

(Sd).....

Counsel for Respondent.

(Sd) T. SUDARSANAM DANIEL,

Industrial Tribunal

[No. L-29025[57]79-D.III.B.]

A. K. ROY, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 1st May, 1980

S.O. 1352.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal Jabalpur, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of the Bank Note Press, Dewas and their workmen.

BEFORE SHRI A. G. QURESHI, M.A., LL.B., PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL—CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Case Ref. No. CGIT/LC(R)(16)/1977

PARTIES

Employers in relation to the Management of the Bank Note Press, Dewas and their workmen Shri R. K. Kapoor, Senior Operator through the Working President, Bank Note Press Karamchari Sangh, Dewas (M.P.).

APPEARANCES :

For Workmen Union ... Shri Gulab Gupta Advocate
For Management ... Shri P. S. Nair, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : Bank Note Press DISTRICT : Dewas (M.P.)

AWARD

Dated : March 28th, 1980

In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour has referred the following dispute, vide Notification No. L-42012 (12)/77-D, II(B) dated 18th August, 1977, to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of the Bank Note Press, Dewas in (a) suspending Shri R. K. Kapoor, Senior Operator, from service with effect from the 5th February, 1976, and (b) replacing the services of the said workman at the disposal of the Government of India Press, Aligarh on the 12th August, 1976 is justified? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled?"

2. This is a dispute between the workers and the management of the Dewas Bank Note Press. Dewas Bank Note Press is a departmental undertaking of the Ministry of Finance, Government of India, New Delhi, printing bank notes of higher denominations of the Government of India. Shri Raj Kumar Kapoor a workman at the Bank Note Press Dewas was working at the Government of India Press Aligarh in the year 1972. He applied to the Dewas Bank Note Press for the post of junior supervisor (Printing) through the Government of India Press Aligarh, but he was not selected for that post. Thereafter on 20th September, 1972 Shri Kapoor again applied through the Government of India Press Aligarh for any post in the Printing Section of the Dewas Bank Note Press. The Dewas Bank Note Press vide its letter dated 8th May, 1973 offered the post of Junior Operator to Shri Kapoor on a temporary basis. Shri Kapoor accepted the offer and was appointed on a temporary post of Junior Operator. Subsequently, on 5-6-1975 Shri Kapoor was promoted to officiate as Senior Operator on ad hoc basis. While working as a Senior Operator on some allegations of serious misconduct against Shri Kapoor he was placed under suspension by an order dated 5-2-1978 passed by the management of Bank Note Press Dewas and later a charge-sheet was issued to him on 3-3-1978 alleging the acts of grave misconduct, i.e., leaving the machine under his charge unattended or partially attended, quarrelling, threatening, mishandling and beating the workers, indulging in heated arguments with his superiors, becoming furious and stopping the machines, disobeying the orders of his superior officers and threatening the superior officers with dire consequences and loosing the temper before the higher officer, abusing him and rushing towards him to assault him and being habitually absent from duty etc.

3. Shri Kapoor denied all the allegations and as a result, a departmental enquiry was held against Shri Kapoor in accordance with the provisions of Central Civil Service, Classification, Control & Appeal Rules, 1965.

4. The domestic enquiry was entrusted to Shri U. R. Kini, Deputy Works Manager but he proceeded on long leave and therefore Shri C. C. Unnikrishnan, Junior Administrative Officer was appointed as an Enquiry Officer who after the completion of the enquiry found Shri Kapoor guilty of the two charges. The findings of the Enquiry Officer were accepted by the Disciplinary Authority. Consequently treating the delinquent as an employee of the Government of India Press, Aligarh, on deputation to Bank Note Press Dewas the Disciplinary Authority ordered his repatriation to Government of India Press Aligarh according to the provisions of Rule 20 of C.C.S. (C.C.A.) Rules, 1965. Thus the services of Shri R. K. Kapoor were placed at the disposal of the Government of India Press, Aligarh for taking disciplinary action against him.

5. The Union raised a dispute against the action of the management which has resulted in the present reference.

6. The case of the management is that Shri Kapoor was a Government servant and as an employee of the Bank Note Press Dewas was necessarily governed by the C.C.S. (C.C.A.) Rules, 1965, Central Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, Revised Leave Rules and Fundamental Rules prescribed for the Government servants. Hence his suspension, enquiry procedure and as a result of the enquiry, placing the services of Shri Kapoor at the disposal of the Government of India Press Aligarh was justified. There was no mala fide on the part of the management and there was no victimisation of Shri Kapoor for his union activities. Shri Kapoor was holding a permanent post in the Government of India Press Aligarh, his lien in that establishment did not come to an end because the services of Shri Kapoor were only temporarily borrowed at the Dewas Bank Note Press and he was not absorbed by the Dewas Bank Note Press permanently. Dewas Bank Note Press being a borrowing authority could not inflict a major punishment on Shri Kapoor, according to the provision of Rule 20 of C.C.S. (C.C.A.) Rules, 1965. Therefore the Bank Note Press was left with no option but to repatriate Shri Kapoor to his parent employer. The order of repatriation is not the final order and no punishment has been inflicted on Shri Kapoor. Hence no industrial dispute could be raised at the interim stage because the final order of punishment has yet to be passed by the competent disciplinary authority. The order of suspension by the Dewas Bank Note Press, the procedure of the enquiry and the enquiry proceedings are also justified by the management in the statement of claim and rejoinder.

7. The management also raised certain legal objections regarding legality of the reference. According to the management, the Dewas Bank Note Press is not an industry, because it is a Government Department discharging regal functions of the Government. Shri Kapoor is a borrowed employee of the Government of India Press Aligarh and after his repatriation to the parent employer there was no employer and employee relationship between the Bank Note Press Dewas and Shri Kapoor. Shri Kapoor was drawing more than Rs. 500 per month and was doing supervisory duties, hence he is not a workman. The dispute is an individual dispute and has not been espoused by a sufficient or large number of workmen. The Government of India made the reference without applying its mind and hence the reference is incompetent.

8. The case of the Union is that Shri Kapoor was being victimised for union activities and the other office bearers of the union were also made to suffer at the hands of the management during the period of emergency. Union itself was derecognised in that period of oppression. Shri Kapoor was derecognised as the Secretary of the Union and the members of the Union were prohibited from holding meetings in the residential area of the Press. The accommodation which had been allotted to the Union by the management for holding its meetings was also got forcibly vacated. Charges levelled against Shri Kapoor were false, frivolous, vexatious, mala fide and illegal. Shri Kapoor was not governed by the C.C.S. (C.C.A.) Rules, 1965. The act of the management in suspending Shri Kapoor was illegal and the domestic enquiry held was also illegal and in violation of the principles of natural justice and fair play. The order of repatriation was also passed with an ulterior motive to deprive Shri Kapoor of the subsistence allowance and to make him starve.

9. My learned predecessor, Shri S. N. Johri, initially framed as many as 13 issues for adjudication of this dispute and he tried the first four issues as the preliminary issues. Shri Johri while deciding the preliminary issues held that Kapoor is a workman, the Bank Note Press is an industry, and that the case has been properly espoused by the Union, there was a employer-employee relationship between Shri Kapoor and the management. As a result, the legal preliminary objections of the management were rejected by an order passed on 16-12-1977. The management challenged the order of the Tribunal on the preliminary issues by a writ petition before the High Court of Madhya Pradesh. The petition was registered as Misc. Petition No. 80/78. Hon'ble High Court of Madhya Pradesh vide its Order dated 6-5-1978 dismissed the writ petition and directed the Tribunal to adjudicate the dispute on merits.

10. My learned predecessor thereafter made an award on 31-7-1979 holding that although Shri Kapoor was a workman and the Bank Note Press was an industry still the Model Standing Orders were not applicable to him because he is a Government servant and so governed by the Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, Fundamental Rules and Supplementary Rules and Government Servants (Conduct) Rules, etc. It was further held that Shri Kapoor was an employee of the Government of India Press Aligarh on deputation to Bank Note Press Dewas and the Aligarh Press was his lending employer and the Dewas Press was the borrowing authority within the meaning of Rule 20 of C.C.S. (C.C.A.) Rules, 1965. Therefore, in view of the applicability of Rule 20 of C.C.S. (C.C.A.) Rules, if the borrowing authority was of the opinion that the proved misconduct called for a major penalty, it had the right to order repatriation of the borrowed employee to the parent department, but that opinion should be a bonafide opinion free from bias or spirit of victimisation and should be on a fair enquiry and evidence in which proper opportunity to defend is given to the delinquent. It was also found that the Tribunal had the jurisdiction to examine the opinion so held by the borrowing authority as a fair opinion, based on cogent and reliable evidence. After going through the evidence on record, it was held that the findings of the Enquiry Officer were totally perverse and indicative of victimisation of Shri Kapoor for the union activities. In the result, the suspension in contemplation of holding a domestic enquiry was held to be justified but the order of repatriation of Shri Kapoor being without any legal basis was found to be unjustified. The findings of the Enquiry Officer was quashed and Shri Kapoor was found not guilty of all the charges levelled against him. The order of repatriation of Shri Kapoor to Government Press Aligarh was also quashed and the reinstatement of Shri Kapoor was ordered, with back wages and all the attendant benefits.

11. Aggrieved by the aforesaid award the management, Bank Note Press Dewas, filed a writ petition before the High Court of Madhya Pradesh, Jabalpur at Bench Indore. Hon'ble the High Court vide its order dated 30-11-1979 in Misc. Petition No. 266/79 allowing the petition of the management held as under :—

- (i) Rule 20 of the C.C.S.(C.C.A.) Rules is attracted when the services of Government servant are lent by one department to another department or to State Government or an authority subordinate thereto or to a local or other authority. Government of India Press Aligarh and Bank Note Press Dewas are two different departments of two different industries of the Government of India. Dewas Bank Note Press at no point of time made a request to the Government of India Press, Aligarh to lend the services of Respondent No.3 (Shri R. K. Kapoor). Shri Kapoor who was a temporary employee of the Government of India Press Aligarh submitted an application to the Bank Note Press, Dewas, for appointment to a post to which he may be considered fit by the petitioner. The application was forwarded by the Government of India Press Aligarh. Dewas Bank Note Press offered a temporary appointment to Shri Kapoor on certain conditions without referring the matter to the Government of India Press, Aligarh. Shri Kapoor accepted the offer and chose to become the employee of Dewas Bank Note Press. Therefore the Dewas Bank Note Press cannot be held to be the borrowing authority and the Government of India Press Aligarh as the lending authority.

As such the provision of Rule 20 of the C.C.S. (C.C.A.) Rules are not applicable to the case of Shri Kapoor. Hence there is no provision which empowers the Bank Note Press, Dewas to place the services of Shri Kapoor at the disposal of the Government of India Press Aligarh.

- (ii) The dispute referred to the Tribunal is limited to the question as to whether replacing the services of Shri Kapoor at the disposal of the Government Press Aligarh were justified. The terms of reference nowhere referred to any order of discharge or dismissal passed by the Bank Note Press Dewas and no such order has been passed by the management. As such, jurisdiction of the Tribunal being limited to the adjudication of the points referred to it, the Tribunal was not empowered to go beyond the terms of reference. The Tribunal also could not decide whether the order of repatriation amounted to an order of discharge or dismissal. The Dewas Bank Note Press has power to impose the penalties of reduction in rank, removal and dismissal against the applicant but that power has not been exercised by the Bank Note Press, Dewas, and it is premature to infer that the management will impose the penalty of removal or dismissal only. Therefore, the Tribunal in the present reference has no jurisdiction to decide whether the penalty of dismissal or discharge could be imposed on Respondent No. 3 (Shri Kapoor) on the basis of evidence adduced before the Enquiry Officer.
- (iii) The Tribunal erred in holding that Shri Kapoor was entitled to full back wages from the date of suspension and other reliefs of increments, confirmation and promotion.
- (iv) Shri Kapoor is entitled to be restored to his position which existed on 12th August, 1976.

12. As a result, the finding of the Tribunal that the suspension of Shri Kapoor in contemplation of a domestic enquiry was permissible under the rules was held to be justified. The order of the Tribunal holding that the management was not justified in replacing the services of Shri Kapoor to Government of India Press Aligarh was also confirmed although for different reasons. However, the order of the Tribunal in quashing the findings of the Enquiry Officer and in holding Shri Kapoor not guilty of the charges levelled against him was held to be erroneous and the order allowing back wages with other reliefs to Shri Kapoor from the date of the suspension was also held to be in excess of the jurisdiction of the Tribunal. Consequently, the award dated 31-7-1979 made by the Tribunal was quashed and a direction was made to the Tribunal to make an award afresh in the light of the aforesaid observations and in accordance with the law after hearing the parties in that behalf.

13. As per directions of the Hon'ble High Court of Madhya Pradesh the parties were heard and the following award is made :—

- (i) The Government of India Press Aligarh and Bank Note Press, Dewas are two different departments of two different industries of the Government of India. Shri Kapoor who was an employee of the Government of India Press Aligarh in the year 1972, submitted an application to the Bank Note Press, Dewas for appointment to a post for which he may be considered fit. As Shri Kapoor was in employment of the Government of India Press Aligarh, he could not apply directly to Dewas Bank Note Press. Hence an application was made through the Government of India Press Aligarh which was forwarded by it, to Dewas Bank Note Press. On receipt of the application, the Dewas Bank Note Press offered the post of Junior Operator to Shri Kapoor on a temporary basis. Shri Kapoor accepted the offer and was consequently appointed as Junior Operator on a temporary basis in the Dewas Bank Note Press. The offer by the Dewas Bank Note Press to Shri Kapoor and the acceptance of Shri Kapoor of that offer was not referred to the Government of India Press Aligarh. Dewas Bank Note Press Dewas never made a request to the Government of India Press, Aligarh to lend the services of Shri Kapoor to Dewas Bank Note Press. It is nowhere on the record that the services of Shri Kapoor were lent by

the Government of India Press Aligarh to Bank Note Press, Dewas. Thus it cannot be held that the Dewas Bank Note Press was the borrowing authority and the Government of India Press Aligarh was the lending authority in respect of the services of Shri Kapoor. Shri Kapoor by accepting the offer made by the Bank Note Press Dewas and thereafter joining the Bank Note Press as a Junior Operator became an employee of the Dewas Bank Note Press. Rule 20 of the C.C.S.(C.C.A.) Rules is therefore not applicable in the case of Shri Kapoor because that Rule applies only when the services of Government Servants are lent by one department to another department or to a State Government or an authority subordinate thereto or to a local or other authority. The Dewas Bank Note Press was, therefore, not authorised to place the services of Shri Kapoor at the disposal of the Government of India Press Aligarh. As such the order repatriating the services of Shri Kapoor to the Government of India Press Aligarh being without any legal basis is not justified. As a result, Shri Kapoor shall be deemed to have continued in the services of the Dewas Bank Note Press. The order of repatriation was passed on 12th August, 1976 and that order being illegal, Shri Kapoor is entitled to be restored to his position which existed on 12th August, 1976. He shall also be entitled to receive such salary and allowances as were payable to him according to rules and terms and conditions from 12th August, 1976.

(ii) It is a common ground that the Dewas Bank Note Press placed Shri Kapoor under suspension vide its order dated 5-6-1976 and a domestic enquiry was instituted against him for charges of gave misconduct. The order of the suspension being in accordance with rule 10(1)(a) of the C.C.S. (C.C.A.) Rules, 1965, by which Shri Kapoor is governed, cannot be held to be illegal. According to that rule in contemplation of a disciplinary proceeding against an employee, the employee can be placed under suspension by the disciplinary authority or any such authority which may be empowered in this behalf. Therefore the order, suspending Shri Kapoor in contemplation of any disciplinary enquiry is perfectly legal and justified.

(iii) In the result, it is held that the action of the management of the Bank Note Press, Dewas in suspending Shri Raj Kumar Kapoor, Senior Operator, with effect from 5th February, 1976 was justified, but, the order of the Bank Note Press, Dewas dated 12-8-1976 replacing the services of Shri Kapoor at the disposal of the Government of India Press Aligarh is not justified. Shri Kapoor is therefore entitled to be restored to his position which existed on 12th August, 1976 and is also entitled to receive such salary and allowances as were payable to him according to rules and the terms and conditions of his service from 12th August, 1976 i.e. the date when the Dewas Bank Note Press passed the order replacing the services of Shri Kapoor at the disposal of the Government of India Press Aligarh. An award is given accordingly.

A. G. QURESHI, Presiding Officer.

Dated : 28-3-80

[No. L-42012(12)/77-D.II(B)]

S.O. 1353.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal Bombay-1, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Telecom Factory, Bombay and their workmen.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, BOMBAY

Reference No. CGIT-28 of 1975

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the Telecom Factory.

AND

Their workman.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Mr. P. R. Namjoshi, Advocate.

For the Workman—Mr. V. Bhaskaran, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : Telecom

STATE : Maharashtra

Bombay, dated the 28th March, 1980

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by order No. L-40011(6)/74-LR.III/D.2(H) dated 3-6-1975 in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, have referred to this Tribunal for adjudication and industrial dispute existing between the employers in relation to the Telecom Factory and their workman in respect of the matters specified in the schedule mentioned below :—

"Whether the action of the management of Telecom Factory, Deorwar, Bombay, in removing Shri S. A. Gaikwad, Motor Driver, from service after 3-1/4 years of the alleged commission of the accident is justified? If not, to what relief is Shri S. A. Gaikwad entitled?"

2. According to the applicant workman he was appointed as Motor Driver by the Opposite Party 4 years before his removal from service. On 18-7-1974 Senior Engineer (T.M.) wrongfully removed him from service in exercise of the powers conferred under rule 19(1) of the Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1965. The alleged misconduct was the involvement of the applicant in a fatal motor accident which took place 3 years prior to his removal from service. The accident took place on 10-3-1971 at about 7.25 a.m. at the Factory premises while the applicant was reversing the bus carrying the employees. One E. Clare a worker from the Factory suffered injury and died in the hospital next day. The applicant was charge-sheeted. It appears however, that he pleaded guilty to the charge. It is the case of the applicant that although the victim was negligent he pleaded guilty because the assurances given by the management that no action would be taken against him so that the widow of the victim who was his co-worker would get substantial compensation.

3. On his pleading guilty he was convicted for one day's R.I. and a fine of Rs. 750 in default to undergo six months' rigorous imprisonment. The sentence was pronounced on 2-4-1972.

4. It is the grievance of the applicant that nothing was done by the Management till 1974 and they did not find the applicant unfit for employment. Since there was no misconduct no departmental enquiry was held and he was not given opportunity to put forward his case. Arbitrary removal according to him amounts to violation of principles of natural justice. He claims to be an industrial worker although he is working as a Driver on the van used for bringing and getting back the employees from the Station to the Factory. Consequently it is said that Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1965 would not apply as provided under Rule 3 of those rules. In any case, he says that no moral turpitude is involved. The conduct which led to his conviction has not been looked into but an order is passed merely on the basis of the conviction which is improper. There was the only solitary incident of the motor accident of the year 1971. Applicant was neither involved in any such accident either earlier or later till his removal. It is only because the management was satisfied about his non-negligent that he was continued in service till the year 1974. Hence it is prayed that the order of removal from service be declared illegal and improper. There was no enquiry before taking disciplinary action. The employer acted mala fide and could not have taken action under section 19(1) of the Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1965. He should therefore, be reinstated with back wages.

5. The Opposite Party has filed written statement admitting that the applicant was employed as Motor Driver with effect from 17-10-1970 and he continued to work as a Driver till his removal on 18-7-1974. The Opposite Party denies that the applicant is an industrial worker so that the Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules do not apply to him. Action taken under Rule 19(1) of the Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules is thus claimed to be justifiable. It is said that the conduct of the applicant in his involvement as the accused has been taking into consideration while removing from service in this connection, it is said that on 10-3-1971 at about 7.25 a.m. when he was driving departmental bus from Railway Station to the Factory site and when after the completion of the first trip the applicant was putting the bus in reverse gear he ignored all rules of safety and security of workers and one E. Clare who was proceeding to the place of his work was knocked down. It is further added that although the applicant appears to have pleaded guilty in the Court of Presidency Magistrate in case no. 771/P of 1972 and although accepting that plea of guilty he was convicted on 2-3-1972, the applicant did not intimate his result to the management. They were not knowing about it until 26-11-1973. Then the conviction was disclosed in a Motor Accident Claims Tribunal filed by the widow of the deceased and hence it is said that the action taken on the basis of that conviction on 18-7-1974 cannot be looked upon as fraught with delay. The Opposite Party denies that they had the knowledge of this conviction in time. They are also denying the allegation of the applicant that he pleaded guilty because he was advised to do so by the management.

6. The Opposite Party, therefore, urges that the applicant was guilty of misconduct because of the rash and negligent manner in which he drove the vehicle and was found guilty of such misconduct. It is pointed out that under Rule 19 there is no necessity to hold any enquiry and the proceedings could be taken based on the conviction itself. The action taken against the applicant is therefore, treated to be proper. It is reported that although the applicant no doubt was working in the factory of the Opposite Party he was not an industrial worker governed by the Factories Act.

7. Oral evidence in this reference consisted of the deposition of the applicant alone. In that deposition the applicant refers to the accident of the year 1971. He admits in cross-examination and his work was restricted to the factory compound and barring a few casual actions for meeting the officer in the cabin he had no reason to enter the factory proper. He does not admit that he was rash and negligent in driving. He is also claiming ignorance when it is stated that the factory workers are classed in two ways—industrial and non-industrial. In answering one of the questions in the cross-examination the applicant says that when the case was heard by the Magistrate, Technical Assistant and Security Officer were present in Court. This is calculated to show that the Opposite Party had immediate intimation of the plea of guilty, made by the applicant.

8. In the arguments Mr. Bhaskaran for the workman referred me to the definition in the Factories Act and he also invited my attention to the provisions of the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946. It is his case that the Telecom Factory is an industrial establishment covered by the definition of Industrial Establishment given in this Act, and hence the procedure to be followed for removing a person will be according to the Standing Orders governing the present establishment. Incidentally, it may be noted that there are certified Standing Orders passed in connection with the workers of the Factory. But according to Mr. Namjoshi for the Opposite Party the present workman who is a driver not connected with the workers in the Factory and having his work restricted to the outside compound of the factory is a person not governed by those Standing Orders. Mr. Namjoshi says that the workers in the factory are divided in two categories—industrial and non-industrial and those who are non-industrial would be governed by Central Civil Services (Classification, Control & Appeal) Rules.

9. According to Mr. Namjoshi although there is an elaborate procedure even under Central Civil Services (Classification, Control & Appeal) Rules for imposing penalties has referred to Rules 16, 17 and 18 of those rules. It is said that rule 19 has the text shows contains a special procedure notwithstanding anything in rule 14 to 18 foregoing. Mr.

Namjoshi is relying upon the first of sub-rule 19 which to the extent relevant reads as follows :—

- (i) where any penalty is imposed on a Government servant on the ground of conduct which has led to his conviction on a criminal charge the disciplinary authority may consider the circumstances of the case and make such orders thereon as it deems fit :

Provided that the Commission shall be consulted, where such consultation is necessary, before any orders are made in any case under this rule. According to Mr. Namjoshi circumstances leading to conviction has been considered and hence the punishment of removal is validly imposed.

10. Mr. Bhaskaran for the workman relied upon the Judgment reported in 1975 LAB. I. C. 1598. The Divisional Personnel Officer, Southern Railway and another v. T. R. Challappan as also the decision in 1973 LAB. I. C. 72 v. P & T Department and the recent decision reported in 1977 LAB. I. C. as Hardayal Singh v. the State of Himachal Pradesh for the proposition that even if there is a conviction disciplinary authority will have to consider the circumstances. He urged that for this purpose the delinquent will have to be given the opportunity to put forward his case and since nothing of the type has happened, the present punishment cannot be sustained.

11. There is no dispute on facts the accident took place in the morning of 10-3-1971. The case was decided on 2-4-1972 and the removal order was passed on 18-7-1974. Although there is a long gap between the period of April, 1972 and July, 1974 it is the case of the Opposite Party that the conviction was not known to them till 26-11-1973. It may however, be remarked that the applicant has given a statement on oath that on the day the conviction was pronounced persons from the side of the management were present in Court. That statement remains uncontroverted and it would be difficult to believe that the management was not knowing of the punishment given in April, 1972 till July, 1974. Apart from it, statement by the management before the Conciliation Officer would show that they had retained the services of the applicant till 1974 because he was found to be an important witness in the compensation proceedings. In other words, the management appears to have acted slowly intentionally so that they did not want to dissatisfy the applicant by taking any action against him as long as the compensation matter was not over. Surely that means, practising double standards. The applicant's services were presumably to be utilised in seeing that the compensation is minimised but at the same time it appears that the management though not feeling that he was not negligent in driving happened to persuade themselves in retaining him as long as it was necessary. The construction put on this conduct by the applicant that as a matter of fact he was known not to have been negligent and hence the management was slow in taking any action against also cannot be brushed aside.

12. The order passed by the Opposite Party against the applicant on 18-7-1974 runs as follows :—

"Whereas Shri S. A. Gaikwad, Motor Driver, Staff No. E/404, has been convicted on a criminal charge by the Presidency Magistrate, 28th Court, Explanade, Bombay, in case no. 771/P of 1972, to wit, under Section 304-A of Indian Penal Code :

And whereas it is considered that the conduct of the said Shri S. A. Gaikwad, Motor Driver, Staff no. E-404, which has led to his conviction is such as to render his further retention in the Public Service undesirable :

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Rule 19(1) of the Central Civil Services (Classification, Control & Appeal) Rules, 1965, the undersigned hereby removes the said Shri S. A. Gaikwad, Motor Driver, S. no. E-404, from service with effect from 18th July, 1974 (A/N).

Sd/-

Senior Engineer (TM),
Telecom Factory, Bombay.

This order purports to be in a set form and does speak of the Senior Engineer considering the conduct of applicant Gaikwad which led to his conviction and it is said that his further retention in public service was undesirable. The applicant however, has consistently made averments first, when writing an approach letter to the Factory on 6-9-1974 again when putting forward his claim before the Conciliation Officer and thirdly, before this Tribunal that he was not served with any notice to show cause why a particular type of punishment should not be meted out to him. This looks to be a relevant fact.

13. On this background we will have to examine the question whether the Central Civil Services (Classification, Control & Appeal) Rules apply in the present case and the other question namely, even if they so apply whether Rule 19(1) has been properly followed.

14. Mr. Bhaskaran for the worker relying upon the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1945, submits that those will be the orders applicable for disciplinary proceedings taken against the worker. According to him Telecom Factory, Deonar is an Industry as defined under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, and that the definition of worker as given in Section 2 Sub-section (S) of the Industrial Disputes Act applies to the present applicant. He was employed as a Motor Driver for bringing or sending back the workers actually working on the machines in the Telecom Factory at Deonar. Driving a motor vehicle will be a skilled type of work and he has been employed on regular monthly payment. He could therefore be looked upon as an industrial worker. Commentary of Mehrotra on the Law of Industrial Disputes Volume I dealing with the expression "industry" as appearing in Section 2(S) shows that a person employed in any industrial establishment in connection with operations incidental to the main industry would be an industrial worker. The learned author observes, "what limitations can be prescribed for determining the incidental operation and where a line can be drawn for this purpose are some of the questions which have yet to be resolved. Generally it may be easy to discern such operation as in the case of Drivers running the buses for a Factory". Under these circumstances the present applicant ought to be looked upon as an industrial worker, under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

15. However, Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946 will reply only if there are no certified Standing Orders. The contention of Mr. Namjoshi that the present applicant is not an industrial worker and therefore he will be governed by Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1965, cannot be fully appreciated in view of the discussion made above.

16. I have before me a booklet styled as "Certified Standing Orders for P & T Workshops at Calcutta, Jabalpur and Bombay". Order No. 2 therein is providing for the extent and application of those orders. Sub-clause (1) of that order refers to the application of the orders to all workman employed in Workshops. It would be correct to say that the present worker who is a Driver enjoined with the duty to take the vehicle away from the Factory compound and bring it back upto the Factory compound, cannot be looked upon as a worker working on any machine in the Workshop. Therefore though an industrial worker falling under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, he would be in my opinion outside the purview of sub-clause (1) of Order 2 of the certified Standing Orders.

17. Sub-clause (2) of order 2 covers other employees. That sub-clause shows that the Staff who are classified as Class I, Class II, Class III and Class IV shall continue to be governed by the Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules. In this connection it will be relevant to refer to Mr. Namjoshi's argument that the present Driver is a Class III employee. My attention was invited to the gazette notification dated December 17, 1973, relating to the fixation of revised pay. However, different categories of workers are found mentioned there. The notification is by the Ministry of Communications, sub-section 4 relates to P & T Department and Clause (c) of that sub-section refers to Telecom Factory Organisation. Entry No. 30 covers the category of Motor Drivers who are shown under the heading Class III posts. It is in this context that the Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules will have to be looked into discarding the argument of Mr. Bhaskaran

that those rules are not applicable and that the case is governed by the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946. Consequently, Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1965, relating to Class III posts will be attracted and the present applicant would be governed by the rules made in that connection. That is to say so far as disciplinary actions are concerned the Rules applicable would be Rules 14 to 19 both inclusive.

18. The present employee was convicted of an offence under Section 304-A, Indian Penal Code and as the order dated 18-7-1974 extracted in paragraph 12 above shows the order of removal was passed under Rule 19(1) of the Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1965. The regular procedure to be followed for inflicting punishment is given in Rules 14 to 18 of these rules. Rule 19 provides an exemption to it. It is a special procedure applicable notwithstanding anything contained in Rules 14 to 18. Clause (1) of the Rule 19 which has been taken recourse to reads as below :

- (i) "where any penalty is imposed on a Government servant on the ground of conduct which has led to his conviction on a criminal charge,..... the disciplinary authority may consider the circumstances of the case and make such orders thereon as it deems fit" :

There is a proviso to Rule 19 according to which consultation with the Public Service Commission is obligatory before passing any such order, if such consultation is necessary. A reading of Regulation No. 5 of The Union Public Service Commission (Consultation) Regulation, 1958, shows that the order passed by the Senior Engineer, Telecom Factory, Bombay, on 18-7-1974 is in respect of an employee for whom consultation with the Union Public Service Commission is not necessary.

19. It must however be remembered that the order is to be passed by the Disciplinary Authority after considering the circumstances of the case. No doubt paragraph 2 of the order recites that the conduct of the said Shri S. A. Gaikwad, Motor Driver, Staff No. E-404, was considered. There is, however, no material on record to show that he was given an opportunity to speak about his conduct or to put forward his representation or views in regard to the penalty proposed. The penalty here is of total removal from service. The applicant has made a consistent grievance that he was not given any opportunity to talk about the punishment. That appears justified from the record.

20. The case law in this connection is instructive. Chronologically, if we see the decision reported in 1973 IAB, I.C. 74 we find the full Bench of the Punjab High Court deciding in Om Parkash v. P & T Deptt. as follows :

- (i) "the departmental punishment of removal or dismissal from Government service is not an essential and automatic consequence of conviction on a criminal charges ;
- (ii) the authority competent to take disciplinary action under Rule 19(1) of the 1965 Rules against a Central Government servant convicted on a criminal charge has to consider all the circumstances of the case and then to decide (a) whether the conduct of the delinquent official which led to his conviction is such as to render his further retention in public service undesirable ; (b) if so, whether to dismiss him or to remove him from service, or to compulsorily retire him; and
- (c) if the said conduct of the official is not such which renders his further retention in service undesirable, whether the minor punishment, if any, should be inflicted on him ;
- (iii) to be punished departmentally for misconduct is not a "disqualification". Within the meaning of Section 12 of the Act, but is a liability under the relevant service rules ;
- (iv) to be retained in Government service or to remain in service is not a qualification, but a right in certain circumstances subject to the relevant constitutional provisions and service rules ;

- (v) the liability to be departmentally published for conduct which has led to the conviction of the employee does not attach to the conviction, but attaches to the original conduct (misconduct) which constituted the offence of which the official has been convicted;

- (xii) an order of dismissal or removal or for compulsory retirement can be passed under Rule 19(i) (without conforming to the procedure prescribed in Rules 14 to 18) not on the basis of the conviction, but only if the competent authority finds that the relevant misconduct of the concerned Government servant renders his further retention in public service undesirable; and
- (xiii) an order imposing a punishment on a Government servant simply because of his conviction on a Criminal charge without reference to the conduct which led to the conviction cannot be sustained."

21. We can also look to the Supreme Court decision reported in 1975 LAB. I.C. 1958 Divl. Personnel Officer v. T. R. Challappan.

The relevant observations at page 1606 are as follows :

"The word 'consider' has been used in contradistinction to the word 'determine'. The rule-making authority deliberately used the word 'consider' and not 'determine' because the word 'determine' has a much wider scope. The word 'consider' merely connotes that there should be active application of the mind by the disciplinary authority after considering the entire circumstances of the case in order to decide the nature and extent of the penalty to be imposed on the delinquent employees on his conviction on a criminal charge. This matter can be objectively determined only if the delinquent employee is heard and is given a chance to satisfy the authority regarding the final orders that may be passed by the said authority. In other words, the term 'consider' postulates consideration of all the aspects, the pros and cons of the matter after hearing the aggrieved person."

22. The Himachal Pradesh High Court in the recent decision Hardayal Singh v. The State of H. P. and others 1977 LAB. IC. 868 has reiterated that principle. The relevant observations at page 872 are as follows :

"It is undoubtedly true that the conviction of a person in a criminal case furnishes good evidence about

his 'bad' conduct but even a bad conduct has its degrees. A conduct can be bad, it can be worse, and it can also be worst. If that is so, and if law permits different types of punishments for different offences, a bad conduct cannot be equated with the worst one in the matter of punishment.

what is needed is the application of mind as regards the selection of a correct punishment having regard to the peculiar facts of each case. Therefore, if the punishing authority has failed to apply its mind to the facts of the case with a view to select a proper form of punishment, the ultimate order which it has passed must fail on that ground."

23. In this particular case the accident has taken place in March, 1972 whereas the order was passed in July, 1974. It has already been noticed that the say of the Management that they were not aware of the result of the criminal case does not look convincing. On the contrary as the correspondence discloses, they wanted to utilize the services of the applicant Driver for making out a case for reducing the compensation. It is indeed unfortunate that a person was killed at the hands of the present applicant. The offence however does not include any moral turpitude. Besides he was allowed to continue in the same service. Obviously, he must have been more careful in future as any further acts proving his negligence in driving have not been listed. When thus confidence was put in his driving, for such a long period, to say suddenly that his further retention in Public service is undesirable, does not appear either convincing or legitimate. In addition no opportunity has been given to him to explain his conduct, or to make amends. On the facts of the case therefore the punishment of removal appears totally unjustified. The most that could have been done after giving him an opportunity was to give him, a warning. In the circumstances of the case total discontinuance from service cannot be upheld. Consequently, because of the procedural irregularity of not giving him any opportunity to put forward his case qua the punishment and because the punishment meted out is undoubtedly harsh, I cannot sustain the order of removal in this particular case.

24. I therefore direct the reinstatement of the present applicant in service with the full implications regarding back wages etc.

C. T. DIGHE, Presiding Officer
[No. L-40011(6)/74-LR.III/D.H(1)]
S. S. BHALLA, Desk Officer